

**Whose policy? A literature review and invited perspectives of CBNRM policy and policy advocacy in six countries of South and Southeast Asia.**

**By**

**Robert W. Solar**

**Requirement of the Exploring Regional CBNRM Policy and Policy Advocacy Project**



International Development Research Centre



International Institute of Rural Reconstruction

## Executive Summary

The following CBNRM policy advocacy literature review is the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction's (IIRR) first step, of a three-step exploratory initiative - 'Exploring Regional Community-Based Policy Advocacy Study', supported by the International Development Research Center (IDRC). The review and study aims to take steps towards broadening CBNRM practitioner-based understanding and use of existing CBNRM practice-based policy advocacy processes and to perhaps 'reveal' some of the many intricacies related to CBNRM policy processes and policy advocacy throughout South and Southeast Asia.

Preparatory steps for this 'literature review' encompassed a web-based review of regional field-based CBNRM policy advocacy institutions, non-governmental organizations, research institutions, and practitioners, an information sharing survey circulated to those identified, and a web-based literature search as the primary informational base of this review. The literature review is focused on six Asian countries – Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Nepal, and the Philippines, encompassing two elements of CBNRM: (1) policy barriers experienced by CBNRM field-based practitioners in Bhutan, China, Cambodia, Nepal, Indonesia and the Philippines; and (2) a review of field-based CBNRM policy advocacy strategies and experiences that fortify participatory decision-making processes and, in part, address inconsistencies in mainstream NRM policy.

Literature presented in relation to policy barriers commonly noted that decentralization and devolution policies strengthen the local elite rather than strengthening equitability among NRM stakeholders; new policies adopted often run counter to informal policies; national NRM policy often conflicts with local governance policy respective of collective rights and ownership vs. private rights and ownership over the natural resource base; an absence of formal policy to recognize and legitimize 'community' as a true entity in NRM with rights and secure tenure over the natural resource base; and that newly formed policies often run counter to the more traditional forms of local natural resource governance.

Literature and survey responses also indicated that although there were similarities in policy 'issue bases', CBNRM policy advocacy strategies employed to address the aforementioned issues varied greatly respective of tools and processes employed. However, strategies fell with the context of the following 5 general tracks of action. These include:

- (1) Initiatives to prepare communities to meaningfully support both 'advocacy' for CBNRM adoption laterally via grassroots participatory extension initiatives, and vertically at local and, in some cases, provincial levels via empowering people's organizations through capability and capacity building;
- (2) Initiatives that extend to / target local government units (LGUs), where efforts are focused on, preparing local government entities to deal with 'decentralization' and power 'devolution' from two perspectives: one, developing LGU ability to work with communities through functional CBNRM relationships; and two, developing LGU ability to engage meaningfully with higher levels of governance in support of CBNRM platforms,
- (3) Initiatives invoking 'communication' processes in capability and capacity building measures to facilitate informational sharing and CBNRM policy engagements among people's organizations (POs), non-government organizations (NGOs) and government entities,
- (4) The use of anthropological, social and political studies, to that which encompasses economics and ecology used to analyze the affects of national NRM policy at local levels, and confer science-based solutions directly to decision makers for processing, and
- (5) Initiatives that reveal the 'realities' of NRM policy at the local level directly to those involved in the formulation and implementation of NRM policies through the creation of a platform for equitable and meaningful dialogue between high-ranking NRM policy makers, NRM implementers and local community members.

Overall, of the five general tracks of CBNRM policy advocacy reviewed, little is still known about the internal workings of each process, how they affect or can affect policy reform on broader scales to address social inequalities and environmental degradation, and how they can be used together to bring about social empowerment.

Within the aforementioned field-based CBNRM policy advocacy strategies, common tools and processes employed were the use of participatory action research (PAR), and joint capacity building through field-based action. However, literature reviewed, and responses given by those surveyed noted the need to better design research projects geared to influence policy and to find new and innovative ways of using CBNRM policy advocacy tools, such as PAR and capacity building, to identify key actors who influence policy, why policymakers change policy, and how formulated CBNRM policy matches CBNRM implementation. Additional information reviewed also indicated that more is needed in way of research that reveals hidden policy barriers relative to CBNRM implementation, and done so in a manner that can be understood by local people.

## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Introduction to CBNRM Policy environments in select South and Southeast Asian countries</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. Contextualizing sustainable development, governance, and community participation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. Principal policy related barriers experienced by field-based CBNRM practitioners in 6 selected Asian countries</b>	<b>5</b>
a. Policy and CBNRM in Cambodia	
b. Policy and CBNRM in Nepal	
c. Policy and CBNRM in Indonesia	
d. Policy and CBNRM in the Philippines	
e. Policy and CBNRM in China	
f. Policy and CBNRM in Bhutan	
<b>V. Review of CBNRM policy advocacy processes employed by field based</b>	<b>14</b>
a. Practitioners Focal supportive CBNRM policy advocacy strategies	
b. Focal engagement CBNRM policy advocacy strategies	
<b>VI. Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. References</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VII. Annex I. Resources for CBNRM Policy Advocacy</b>	<b>31</b>

## **List of Tables**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Table 1. Focal supportive CBNRM policy advocacy strategies employed in selected South and Southeast Asian countries.</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Table 2. Focal engagement CBNRM policy advocacy strategies employed in selected South and Southeast Asian countries.</b>	<b>23</b>

## Acronyms

<b>ADMP</b>	Ancestral Domain Management Plan
<b>AFMA</b>	Agricultural and Fisheries Modernization Act
<b>AFN</b>	Asian Forestry Network
<b>ASEAN</b>	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
<b>CADC</b>	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim
<b>CB</b>	Community Based
<b>CF</b>	Community Forestry
<b>CBFM</b>	Community Based Forestry Management
<b>CBFMA</b>	Community Based Forestry Management Agreement
<b>CBNRM</b>	Community Based Natural Resource Management
<b>CFDG</b>	Community Forestry Operational Guidelines
<b>CRMF</b>	Community Resource Management Framework
<b>CRMP</b>	Community Resource Management Project
<b>CFRP</b>	Community Forestry Research Project
<b>CFUG</b>	Community Forest User Group
<b>DA</b>	Department of Agriculture
<b>DAO</b>	Department Administrative Order
<b>DENR</b>	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
<b>DFO</b>	District Forest Officer
<b>DoF</b>	Department of Forestry
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment
<b>EO</b>	Executive Order
<b>FAO</b>	Fisheries Administrative Order
<b>FARMC</b>	Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council
<b>FRMP</b>	Fisheries Resource Management Program
<b>FSP</b>	Fisheries Sector Program
<b>FUG</b>	Forestry User Group
<b>GAAS</b>	Guizhou Academy of Agricultural Sciences
<b>GO</b>	Governmental Organization
<b>HKH</b>	Hindu Kush Himalayas
<b>HUAF</b>	Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry
<b>HUS</b>	Hue University of Science
<b>ICT</b>	Information and Communication Technologies
<b>IDRC</b>	International Development and Research Center
<b>IIED</b>	International Institute for Environment and Development
<b>IIRR</b>	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
<b>IPRA</b>	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
<b>ISO</b>	Institute of Social Order
<b>ITTO</b>	International Tropical Timber Organization
<b>IUCN</b>	International Union for Conservation of Nature
<b>LIBIRD</b>	Local Initiatives for Biodiversity and Development
<b>LGC</b>	Local Government Code
<b>LGU</b>	Local Government Unit
<b>MOFSC</b>	Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation
<b>NGO</b>	Non Governmental Organization
<b>NO.</b>	Number

## Acronyms Cont'

<b>NRM</b>	Natural Resource Management
<b>ODI</b>	Overseas Development Institute
<b>OECD</b>	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
<b>PAFID</b>	Philippine Association for International Development
<b>PAR</b>	Participatory Action Research
<b>PCSD</b>	Participatory Communication Strategy Design
<b>PISA</b>	Participation Information Systems Appraisal
<b>PLUP</b>	Provincial Land Use Planning
<b>PO</b>	Peoples Organization
<b>PRA</b>	Participatory Rural Appraisal
<b>PRCA</b>	Participatory Rural Communication Appraisal
<b>RA</b>	Republic Act
<b>RAPID</b>	Research and Policy in Development
<b>REA</b>	Resource Ecological Assessment
<b>RECOFTC</b>	Regional Community Forestry Training Center
<b>RNRRC</b>	Renewable Natural Resource Research Center
<b>RUP</b>	Resource Use Plan
<b>SANREM</b>	Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research
<b>CRSP</b>	Support Program
<b>SFM</b>	Sustainable Forest Management
<b>SLAPP</b>	Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation
<b>3-D</b>	Three Dimensional

## **Acknowledgements**

From advocacy organizations to people, from the city streets to rural communities, and from complaints to action, NRM policy advocacy has evolved and still is. Hence, documenting today's CBNRM policy advocacy initiatives 'justly' takes the efforts of many. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all the field-based CBNRM policy advocacy practitioners throughout the region, who have actively shared their experiences and insights for this review; and to my colleague, and friend Shayamal Saha for his 'critical' thought, making this truly and learning process. Finally, to Dr. Scott Killough, I would like to convey my sincere appreciation for providing structure to the review, and guidance.

**Robert W. Solar**



# **Whose policy? A literature review and invited perspectives of CBNRM policy and policy advocacy in six countries of South and Southeast Asia.**

---

## **I. Introduction**

NRM field-based practitioners and researchers are becoming increasingly aware of the role community-driven policy advocacy could play in the integration of environmental management and social justice. There have been several initiatives carried out to contend with policy barriers in CBNRM. For example, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the Philippines has been experimenting with linking people to policy through the creation of platforms for local communities, researchers and those that influence NRM policy to come together, share their experiences, and debate NRM policy-related issues. The Guizhou Academy of Agricultural Sciences (GAAS) in China has been experimenting with localized capability building processes and the creation of supportive institutional environments for collective CBNRM actions by local communities. And in Cambodia, the International Development Research Center (IDRC) has supported participatory action research projects focused on creating relationships to support CBNRM, and to ensure that communities play an integral role in the development of NRM policies. However, these efforts have been met with only partial success and gaps in field-based CBNRM policy advocacy knowledge persists, and methodologies developed to deal with policy barriers and policy change are not widely documented and shared.

The following CBNRM policy advocacy literature review is IIRR's first step, of a three-step exploratory initiative - 'Exploring Regional Community-Based Policy Advocacy Study', towards broadening the understanding and use of existing CBNRM practice-based policy advocacy processes throughout South Asia and Southeast Asia. The study envisions contributing to the advancement of CBNRM in the Asian region via exploring and perhaps 'revealing' some of the many intricacies related to CBNRM policy processes and policy advocacy through a learning, sharing, and support process involving field-based CBNRM implementers. Through design, the study aims to explore the complexities of policy and policy change by learning from existing field-based experiences and actors engaged in CBNRM implementation and policy advocacy work. The study is also designed to provide a communication platform where 'actors' facing policy challenges in the region can exchange lessons and develop new and innovative CBNRM policy advocacy strategies relevant to field-based realities.

Preparatory steps for this 'literature review' encompassed a web-based review of regional field-based CBNRM policy advocacy institutions, non-governmental organizations, research institutions, and practitioners (among others) in the region, identifying their program and research thrusts, and published literature. Subsequently, a CBNRM policy advocacy information sharing survey was circulated to those identified, requesting detailed information on their CBNRM policy advocacy initiatives,<sup>1</sup> strategies employed, related views from communities they work with, related publications, as well as needed practitioner based capabilities and capacities. Information acquired was also used as an informative guide to further a web-based literature search.

The study is focused on six Asian countries – Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Nepal, and the Philippines for two specific reasons, (1) the chosen six countries represent a diversity of natural resource management policy environments, i.e. centralized, and early to more progressive stages of decentralization, and (2) they are countries where examples of good and innovative field-based CBNRM

---

<sup>1</sup> Strategies: refers to the way policy advocacy is employed from an aspect of 'process' and how field-based CBNRM practitioners employ their resources to undertake policy advocacy related to their CBNRM efforts.

policy advocacy initiatives are present, and can be utilized for further learning, and innovation support within the IDRC and IIRR network.

The initial phase of the literature review begins with an introduction CBNRM policy environments in select Asian countries, followed by background information contextualizing sustainable development, governance, and community participation in relation to CBNRM in the region. The body of the literature review focuses on two elements of CBNRM: (1) policy barriers experienced by CBNRM field-based practitioners in Bhutan, China, Cambodia, Nepal, Indonesia and the Philippines; and (2) a review of field-based CBNRM policy advocacy strategies and experiences that fortify participatory decision-making processes and, in part, address inconsistencies in mainstream NRM policy. This literature review has also been partnered to a review of current and developing CBNRM policy advocacy practice-based tools utilized in the region – all making this a working document that aims to broaden field-based CBNRM policy advocacy participation and shared learning.

## **II. Introduction to CBNRM policy environments in select South and Southeast Asian countries**

Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) is widely accepted throughout South Asia and Southeast Asia as a practical solution to natural resource management in today's context of environmental management and social development (CBCRM RC, 2001). However, policy-related barriers often affect explicit implementation of this valid NRM platform. Below is an example of one such barrier manifested between written policy and the interpretation of the policy at a national level for field implementation:

Cambodian Commune Council Law as stated: "The Commune Council plays the main role to protect natural resources in the commune."

Cambodia national administrative position: "Forestry Law has no provision within granting Commune Councils rights to manage forests."

(John, A.J.I. & C. Phalla, 2004)

Field based CBNRM practitioners have often expressed difficulty in dealing with these 'barriers' to the extent that policy researchers have highlighted them as constraints to achieving environmental stability and social development initiatives within the greater scope of their work. Notably, 'policy' is not always a barrier to environmental sustainability and social development and, at times, is moving in the direction of being 'facilitative' of CBNRM initiatives.

In any CBNRM undertaking, stakeholder participation is, if not a precondition, a strategic means to achieving good natural resource management, and as an end to empower local people in developing their knowledge and capacity to influence decisions that affect their natural resource based livelihoods. Recent literature has shown that a more sophisticated understanding of participation and the sociological dimensions of natural resource access and use have shaped a new generation of community-based forestry and coastal management policies to include a wider breadth of social justice, local empowerment and 'decentralized' resource management (Lindayati, 2000). In the Philippines – where community forestry and coastal management policies are most developed among Southeast Asian countries – various programs, such as the Forest Lease Management Agreement, Certificate of Ancestral Domain/Land Claim, and municipal waters delineations, represent different types of land and aquatic use governance arrangements and property regimes (La Viña, 2000) under a decentralized governance scheme.

In Nepal, the concept of community-based forestry as a collective endeavor emerged out of the failures of earlier top-down governance initiatives (Gilmour and Fisher, 1991). Differences between the perspectives of policymakers and rural people were reconciled in the late 1980s when contradictions in policy applications and local-level concerns were mediated by stakeholders and incorporated into both practice and policy. Revised frameworks for community forestry legislation, i.e. Master Plan for the Forestry Sector in 1989, Forest Act of 1993, Forest Regulations in 1995, facilitated CBNRM processes by reaffirming the government's policy of assigning more responsibility to local communities, at the same time allowing communities to benefit equitably from their activities, e.g. funds accrued from forest-related activities are controlled by user groups and spent on community development activities (Shrestha and Britt, 1998).

Knowing that 'policy' can be at times facilitative in nature, policy-related barriers in many countries, including the Philippines and Nepal, still exist. Cambodia, Vietnam and Indonesia are in their early to midstream stages of decentralizing natural resource management practices and policies, and show clear examples of barriers to CBNRM goals. Relevant literature indicates that wider dimensions of social justice and local empowerment have yet to be realized on broad scales. In the case of Indonesia, implementation of regional autonomy is characterized by intense struggles among different levels of government, each of which represents a competing set of political and economic interests (McCarthy, 2001). Subsequently, community representation in NRM is currently not centralized in actual field-based policy/governance processes. In Vietnam, the implementation of CBNRM resulting in sustainable resource management and social justice is hampered by the mere fact that first, there are no legal documents defining the legal status of community; and secondly, there are no legal documents recognizing people and communities at the village level as legal entities to benefit from natural resources when participating in the management, protection and development of their surrounding natural resource base (Phuong, P. X., 2001).

In Bhutan, forest and water resources are under state ownership and said to be managed with little community involvement (DRDS, 2002). However, recent literature indicates that Bhutan has decentralized development to district (*dzongkhag*) and block (*geog*) levels since the 8th Five Year Plan (Bhutan, 1997) so as to engage people in development planning and management of natural resources (UNDP, 2000). Nevertheless, with limited experience in community 'participation', the implementation of this goal has been noted as 'challenging' (DRDS, 2002). In 2002, midterm planning exercises involved communities of all the 202 *geogs*, or administrative blocks, in defining their development needs and aspirations for the first time in Bhutan. However, it was felt that sector-specific technical departments were ineffective in delivering CBNRM service needs as they did not have direct control of their extension personnel in the field (MoA, 2003). Further compounding this initiative, literature indicates that communities considering 'community forest user group' (CFUG) agreements doubted that benefits would be equitably shared and that these would limit existing access and tenure rights to natural resources under the current Forest and Nature Conservation Act of 1995 (RGoB, 1995).

In China, state ownership and management of natural resources, legal and policy frameworks are still centralized, which means key policymaking and relevant implementations of resource management are controlled by the central government. Recent literature, however, points to trends of reform related to environmental governance, including decentralization and transparency reforms that, at times, aid in CBNRM implementation processes and, at other times, hinder CBNRM processes. One key institutional change has been the 'Ethnic Regional Autonomy and Self-Organization' where the Autonomous Law of National Minority Areas was promulgated in 1984 and revised in 2000, allowing autonomous governments (e.g. those of Xinjiang, Tibet, Inner Mongolia, Ningxia, and Hui) to have more rights in legislation and administration. In the late 1990s, the direct election of village committees was organized to encourage village communities to be more responsible in their affairs, including NRM and social development (Ting, 2002). Wilkes (2005), on the other hand, indicates that there are still policy and

institutional issues that need more consideration and solutions. For example, although the introduction of democratic elections has resulted in more accountability in NRM practice at the village level, forestry management and associated projects are still implemented in a top-down fashion and forestry agencies are not accountable to villagers.

### **III. Contextualizing sustainable development, governance, and community participation**

Policy and governance is an integral part of sustainable development and environmental management, and without appropriate and responsive ‘governance’ over the natural resource base, services provided by these resources are often unequally distributed, or cease to function. Political stability, social equity and environmental sustainability, in the most general sense, go hand in hand as requirements in achieving and fostering the guiding principles of sustainable development – environmental sustainability and social justice. But what are the underlying conditions needed for policy, good governance and sustainable development. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has identified the aspect of ‘decentralized’ governance as a advantage, if not a condition, in which local level policy advocacy processes could address and impact social, economic and environmental issues as a product of inapt (unsuitable and inappropriate) centrally-formed national policies. Notably, if a clear definition of the respective roles of local, regional and national-level authorities and institutions in policy development can be achieved within emerging decentralized governments, then decentralization offers an effective mechanism for the convergence of different decision-making processes and planning frameworks.

Consistently within the literature, decentralization and participation are accorded a central place in the discourse on environmental management and social development (Osmani, 2000; McCathy, 2001; Chen and Uitto, 2003; Ojha, Pokharel, Paudel and McDougall, 2002; and Brosius and Lowenhaupt, 1998). A scan of the literature identifies two sets of problems that stand in the way of establishing a truly participatory decentralized governance of natural resources – those that relate to the devolution of power from the top and those that relate to genuine involvement of the poor from the bottom. It has been noted that tackling both of these problems through the creation of an environment that empowers people to exercise their voice in the affairs of NRM governance and participate in the decision-making processes is fundamental to CBNRM project and program implementation. The problem of common property resource management is often given as a prime example of this problem base where the capacity to make binding, non-voluntary decisions backed by legally sanctioned coercive power is absent (i.e. the necessity to first establish a legally sanctioned structure of decentralized governance within which community-based organizations actively and meaningfully partake in NRM governance).

The concept of participatory decentralized governance has evolved over time and taken on diverse meanings (Mawhood and Davey, 1980; Landau and Eagle, 1981; Mawhood, 1983; Conyers, 1983, 1984). Consistent within this literature is the concept that local authorities should be institutionally separate from central government, and government administrators should withdraw from an executive to an advisory and supervisory role in relation to local governance. Of the four forms of ‘decentralization’ defined by Cohen et al. (1981), e.g. Deconcentration, Devolution, Delegation, and Privatization/Partnership, deconcentration amounts to the least amount of transfer of power to the local people. As such, this type of administrative organization can hardly be described as a move towards the development of local governance. Delegation, too, does not, by itself, transfer power to the local people, although the delegated agencies have the scope for involving local people in their decision-making process. Conversely, devolution and privatization/partnership seemingly provides the largest scope for developing genuinely local-level governance based on equitable participation.

It is arguable that people's participation in the process of governance is an essential precondition for successful decentralization of CBNRM perspectives. This is so from the point of view of both efficiency and equity. One of the reasons why decentralization is claimed to be conducive to efficiency and equity is because it enables local-level services to be tailored according to local preferences (Adato et al, 1999b; and Manor, 1999). But what is the mechanism through which local preferences are to be known and equitably benefited from? Osmani (2000) has stated that the only feasible way is to have an 'inclusive' process of local governance – more commonly known as co-management – through which stakeholders can express and fight for their preferences. This point is underlined by Klooster (2000) in a comparison between successful and unsuccessful cases of community-based resource management in Mexico. However, one CBNRM case study situated in Southern Laos (Tubtim, 2004) demonstrates CBNRM success through the use of 'exclusive' processes (i.e. local community only), lending credence to literature encompassing the utilization of and value of local people's knowledge about local conditions in solving local problems efficiently and equitably. Perhaps the principles of inclusive and exclusive governance relative to 'success' in CBNRM needs further study.

There are many cited obstacles to the creation of an environment that empowers people to participate in NRM and social development decision-making processes; however, two seemingly stand out in the literature. The first lies in the reluctance of politicians and bureaucrats at the higher echelons of governance to relinquish power to the lower levels. The second is the inability of weaker segments of the population to make their voice heard within existing political environments and structures. Notably, CBNRM policy advocacy is seen as a starting point to overcoming both of these obstacles. In the following section, principle policy barriers experienced by field-based CBNRM practitioners is reviewed. This is then followed by a review of policy advocacy strategies employed to address these barriers.

#### **IV. Principal policy related barriers experienced by field-based CBNRM practitioners in 6 selected Asian countries**

Even though CBNRM initiatives are said to flourish under decentralized and decentralizing NRM governance, specific policy barriers do exist. This Annex first reviews a summary perceived policy-related CBNRM barriers in form and in context within Cambodia, Nepal, Indonesia and the Philippines taken from case studies and 'policy' commentaries. These experiences are within 'decentralized' scenarios. Then, we will review perceived policy-related CBNRM barriers in China and Bhutan as perspectives from within 'centralized' governance.

##### **a. Policy and CBNRM in Cambodia**

Decentralization and local governance reform processes in Cambodia have taken hold in many areas of the country, and so has CBNRM frameworks. Literature has shown that consistent efforts have been made by researchers, donor agencies, government officials at all levels and communities throughout to develop and implement NRM policies from a bottom-up approach. This is done so in consideration of indigenous people's rights to access and utilization of their surrounding natural resource base. Efforts have resulted in negotiated agreements on communal resource management between communities and provincial governments, as well as the recognition of resource tenure and rights of indigenous peoples to manage their natural resources (John and Phalla, 2004; Nong and Marschke, 2004; Kamnap and Ramony, 2004; and Marschke, Nong and Vantha, 2000). Although noted throughout the literature as a significant development, interpretations of crafted laws, such as the 'Forestry Law' and 'Commune Council Law', are at odds with each other over rights to manage Cambodia's forest (e.g. from a national administrative position). The Forestry Law has no provision within granting Commune Councils rights to manage forests, and yet, the Commune Council Law stipulates, "The Commune Council plays the main role to

protect natural resources in the commune.” John and Phalla, (2004) have noted that the Commune Council, being the lowest government administrative unit, must strengthen all line departments within to be able to take on a central role in natural resource management.

The presence of, lack of, or coordination of – depending on perspective – legal frameworks in which CBNRM can operate and be supported consistently in Cambodia is a recurring theme within the literature. For example, local level resource management institutions can formulate CBNRM plans that include rules and regulations along with an area to manage. Often, these plans are recognized by appropriate technical institutions including provincial governors, and in cases where the village is within a protected area, recognized by the Cambodian Minister of Environment. However, it must be noted that there are no legal procedures or instruments to support such activities at national levels of governance. As various Cambodian ministries are said to interpret laws to suit their needs, the prospect of ‘tension’ over the implementation of new policies in support of CBNRM at the provincial level are probable.

Recent trends in ‘policy’ interpretation reveal further problematic areas for CBNRM implementation. For example, shifting cultivation forests once recognized as community property that could not be alienated, are being converted into cashew plantations and sold to outside interests. This leads to complicated tenurial changes and concerns over and conflicts within communities about these complicated issues that pit the rights of individuals to claim private ownership against the rights of the community to protect forest-based livelihoods. Even in communes where John and Phalla (2004) have pointed out that CBNRM processes were strong, conflicts continue over enforcement of local management rules and boundaries. Recent literature also indicates that national level agencies now question the validity of provincially negotiated resource-management agreements (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004). For example, recent regulatory changes put the responsibility for community forest planning within the Ministry for Agriculture – Forestry and Fisheries. However, in the province of Ratanakiri, the Department of Environment has led integrated provincial land use planning (PLUP) and CBNRM activities, as well as facilitating the approval of local resource management plans. Hence, CBNRM literature based on Cambodian experiences often points to the division of resource jurisdiction as having severe implications for CBNRM initiatives. Inevitably, having separate line agency with jurisdiction over different resources (forests, water, fisheries, agriculture etc.) causes an overlap / conflict in decision-making at the field level. This also makes the integration of environmental management and social development initiatives with planning and management interventions difficult (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004; Marschke, Nong and Vantha, 2000).

#### **b. Policy and CBNRM in Nepal**

Nepal’s forestry sector has demonstrated an innovative approach to governance through its nationwide community forestry program. This involves the complete decentralization of forest management authority to local citizens who depend on forest resources (Ojha and Timsina, 2004). By the mid-1990s, community forestry approaches, enacted in the form of Community Forest User Groups (CFUGs), shifted from environmental protection issue bases to a wider ‘rights-based’ social development dimension (Shrestha and Britt, 1998). The Forest Act of 1993 and Forest Regulation of 1995 recognized CFUGs as ‘autonomous and corporate institutions with perpetual succession’ and rights to acquire, sell and transfer forest products (Ojha and Timsina, 2004). However, within the literature it has often been said that the elite still dominate decision-making, and the lack of community based supportive policies is said to have turned community forestry into committee forestry (Shrestha and Britt, 1998; McDougall et al, 2002; Ojha et al, 2002; Hoskins and Acharya, 2004). Accordingly, anxiety in civil society circles over perceived counter moves to community forestry at the policy-making level (the Second Amendment to the Forest Act, the National Park Act and Biodiversity Reserves) threaten to override existing FUGs and/or reduce user rights.

In the post-1995 phase of community forestry, with well-established legislation in place, a series of critical ‘second generation issues’ or policy challenges have emerged. These include issues related to post-formation support; equity in decision making and benefit-sharing; and commercial use of the natural resource base (Gilmour, 2002; and Ojha et al, 2002). Yet, despite indications of earlier active and iterative policy formulation, recent literature indicates that currently at all levels – from forest user groups (FUGs) to the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (MOFSC) – decision-makers often follow an ‘unmonitored experience’ approach to devise solutions to the aforementioned issues (Ojha et al, 2002; and Pokharel et al, 2002). As a result, in 1998, amendments made to the Forestry Act of 1993 resulted in the restrictions of ‘rights’ to CFUGs and the granting of more power to the District Forest Officers (DFOs) to influence policy and policy implementation (Ojha and Timsina, 2004; HMGN, 1998). In 2000, a circular was distributed suspending the formation of further CFUGs; in 2001, revisions to the Community Forestry Operational Guidelines (CFOG) imposed additional technicalities on CFUGs’ management of forests without accompanying additional support services for compliance, thus, complicating forestry handover processes. And in 2002, the Nepal Biodiversity Strategy (NBS) is said to have undermined community approaches to biodiversity conservation (Ojha and Timsina, 2004). Notably, the Local Self-Governance Act still has several provisions that contradict with CFUG rights established by the Forestry Act of 1993 (Ojha and Timsina, 2004).

Overall, literature indicates that despite breakthroughs in CBNRM related participatory policies; there are still no adequate nor effective linkages among differing levels of NRM governance in Nepal (Pokharel et al 2002, Ojha et al 2002), and the corresponding lack of responsiveness by NRM decision-making and policy.

### **c. Policy and CBNRM in Indonesia**

Since late 1998, Indonesia has undergone a process of rapid and far-reaching decentralization. With this process, considerable degrees of administrative and regulatory authority have been transferred from the national government to the country’s provincial and district governments. Over recent years, the national government has issued several important pieces of legislation aimed at transferring authority to the provincial and district governments. This has allowed resource-rich regions to retain a larger share of the fiscal revenues generated within their jurisdictions. Most significant to forestry management are Law 22 on Regional Governance (1999) and Law 41 (1999), a revised version of Indonesia’s Basic Forestry Law that outlines the division of administrative authority in the forestry sector under regional autonomy.

Both formal and informal processes of decentralization are occurring in Indonesia, and have sweeping implications for CBNRM and the livelihoods of communities living in and around forest and coastal areas. In cases where the local elite are strong, and/or traditionally marginalized groups have been unable to organize themselves, decentralization has often strengthened pre-existing power relations, rather than promoting democratic decision-making processes (Utting, 1993). Literature indicates that while districts now enjoy more control and economic benefits from the Indonesian forests, there is a high risk of reconcentration of power at the district level. Barr and Resosudarmo, (2002) contribute this to (1) government officials lacking accountability to villagers, and (2) communities lacking secure legal rights to resources as a result ‘inconclusive’ legalities surrounding community land claims over forest lands.

Forest policy in Indonesia is shifting from a ‘natural forest-logging’ phase to an industrial plantation phase centered on the reforestation of degraded land. However, literature points to growing friction between forest inhabitants and current forest policy over land expropriation for industrial tree plantations. For example: Indonesia has classified its forests at national and provincial levels into nature reserves, protection forests, limited production forests, production forests and conversion forests (Barr and Resosudarmo, 2002; and Sakumoto, 2002). Accordingly, this zoning scheme has various problems, the most serious being that of exclusion. Even though the Forestry Act of 1999 – No. 41 provides for the

rights and responsibilities of the community, and a stated supporting role for the government to promoting community participation - current land use by resident communities is not taken into account during zoning process. This limits community involvement in forestry management from the onset. Sakumoto (2002) also points to legal ambiguities within the Act that counter act the balance of authority between provinces and regencies / municipalities. Also stated are difficulties in interpretation of regulations, duplicity of legislation, and the lack of legal support for participatory forest management.

Three salient concerns relating to sustainable forest management (SFM) can be identified within the literature from a legal/policy perspective in Indonesia. *Adat* or communal, indigenous law is regarded as 'the living law' and as the most reliable legal structure throughout Indonesia – excluding Java, Madura and Bali Islands. However, this 'living law' has not been fully integrated into or supported by a formal legal framework. Accordingly, *adat* laws are relied upon at the local level to order communal life, but are ineffective in enforcing common standards in situations of modern financial transactions with external groups or individuals, as well as in preventing illegal logging. The devolution of environmental management authority to the regions also poses serious problems for community forestry management, i.e. national policy lacks sufficient regulatory provisions to support local level governance, and local level management lacks the capacity to cope with policy formulation and implementation from national levels of governance (Barr et al, 2001; Barr and Resosudarmo, 2002; Sakumoto, 2002; and Wardoyo and Masripatin, 2002).

As in the forestry sector, public policy regarding ocean and coastal resource use and conservation is difficult and sometimes a hazy process that includes powerful vested interests and complicated issues of access and use-rights (Dahuri, 2001). Rudiyanto (2002) concludes that Indonesia faces major challenges in terms of sustainable marine and coastal development in the establishment of an appropriate community based coastal management regime that is partnered to policy measures capable of attaining the objectives of sustainable development. Rudiyanto (2002) also states that currently, Indonesia is not a marine-oriented nation; thus, marine and coastal affairs are not at the top of the public policy agenda. Accordingly, Kompas (2000) indicates that NGOs and people's organizations representing fishing and coastal communities are concerned that regional autonomy may strengthen the hand of the local elite, and that local military commanders will use regional autonomy to gain more control over coastal resources and collect more profit from their already well-established partnerships with commercial enterprises.

As mentioned, the Regional Autonomy Act No. 22 (1999) gives power to local governments to manage the natural resource base – coastal resources – starting in January 2001. This Act was expected to achieve democratic decentralization, a key elements capable of fostering CBCRM initiatives from within through provisions that defined administrative areas offshore, i.e. four miles from the coastline in the case of districts (*kabupaten*) and cities (*kotamadya*), and from this distance seaward to twelve miles for provincial authorities and interest. Authority includes exploration, exploitation, conservation, natural resources management and preservation. As a result, local communities and governments have control over ocean and coastal resources for the first time since the 1945 Constitution, which provided for complete central government control of all oceans and coastal resources. However, local communities and governments in Indonesia have historically looked to the central government to create policy to protect resources, to enforce rules and to generate activities, particularly in the last several decades. Even in the era of decentralization, a recent attitudinal survey about ocean and coastal resource management indicated that this perspective is still held by the vast majority of the population surveyed (Kompas, 2000; and Rudiyanto, 2002).

The distinctive characteristics of Indonesia as an archipelago underpin the basic philosophy of marine and coastal policy and management throughout Southeast Asia. Literature has identified three factors being major influences on the evolution of marine and coastal policy in Indonesia: (1) international law, (2) marine science, and (3) state of the art marine and coastal management practices



that include CBCRM processes. Notably, policy barriers affecting CBCRM implementation in Indonesia are not widely known to date. Literature contributes this in part to ‘stages’ in governance and decentralization, Indonesia being at an early stage with resulting lag phases for even the most basic CBCRM efforts (Hanson et al, 2003).

As CBCRM has only begun to take root in Indonesia, implementation of an empowering CBCRM platform hinges on changing residual beliefs centered on the central government being solely responsible for ocean and coastal resources, changing the expectations for central government’s provision of services related to these resources and localized management, and being able to bridge capacity gaps to enable local stewardship and initiative.

#### **d. Policy and CBNRM in the Philippines**

The Philippines is often considered ‘advanced’ relative to localized policy formation and community based decision-making processes throughout Southeast Asia. At the same time ‘critics’ of CBNRM-related policy question the validity of this thought. Even though the institutionalization of local governance and the acceptance of CBNRM are firmly rooted within the country, CBNRM policy barriers still exist in a combination of forms – political, social and cultural. Literature points to traditional forest management practices, user rights and ownership as examples. Utilizing a series of legislative acts and administrative orders (e.g. the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act [IPRA] – Republic Act (RA) 8371, the Local Government Code – RA 7160, Department of Natural Resources (DENR) Administrative Order 2 – Ancestral Domain Management Plan (ADMP), and Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim [CADC]), traditional resource management rights over a territory could be issued to formalize traditional resource management rights. However, an ADMP requires a municipal or barangay unit for governance and does not recognize customary units for resource management. This leaves customary resource management units without a formal place in the planning processes that accompany the formulation of the ADMP (Mendoza et al, 2004). Additionally, the CADC does grant traditional resource management rights over a territory but not ownership.

Clashes between indigenous tenure systems and state laws are most visible in the Philippines when rights to the forests are in question. By national law, forests are publicly owned and fall directly under the management and control of the DENR. However, literature in relation to this topic indicates that day-to-day community member practices’ follow customary law in the utilization and management of the forest and its products. Notably, forest related privatization policy further complicates CBNRM implementation. As an example, required payments for tax declarations related to the ‘forest lands’ covered by said agreements are required to be made by the administrator of the ethnic group, but national law interprets the resulting document as proof of the administrator’s private ownership. This gives way to many issues related to ‘privatization’ of forestlands and moves away from the premise of CBNRM doctrines (Mendoza et al, 2004; and La Viña, 2000). Below is an example of how and in what form tenure issues and policy barriers have emerged in the Municipality of Sagada, Mountain Province.

Troublesome issues have emerged in the Municipality of Sagada, Mountain Province over lumber harvested from clan-owned forests and transported out of the municipality. Lumber, traditionally a ‘free’ but non-market good, has become an economic commodity with a market value. Such developments put a pressure on land and traditional rights and management agreements. Hence, communal forestlands are now being subject to privatization and, thus, to a different set of tenure rules as a response to the rise of lumber prices. Further, communal forestlands ‘*ili*’ have all but disappeared in the villages of Ankileng and Demang, largely in response to population growth, which has led to their transformation into clan and family agricultural lands. The legal personality of the holders of the CADC remained to be clarified, since the CADC is issued to the village elders or heads on behalf of a traditional community or *ili*. However, what authority do they have to enter into contracts regarding the use of resources in their ancestral domain? Can the certificate-holder accept or deny a proposal by a logging company to cut lumber from Sagada forests? Alternatively, is the DENR still the final arbiter and authority on this matter (Mendoza et al, 2004)?

Much of the Philippine forests are not covered by ancestral claims and are subjected to a differing set of laws and policies that within have barriers to CBNRM implementation. Common examples of such are those identified by IIRR through forestry-related Participatory Action Research (PAR) conducted throughout the country. Presented below are excerpts of ideas from community members from this research related to policy barriers and community based forestry management (IIRR, 2005).

“The core problem is that community forestry politics in the Philippines are focused on ordering us how to manage forests, not on allowing us to decide how to manage them.”

“The inequitable access to and control over land, capital and other resources leads to conflict over the use and management of the forest.”

(IIRR, 2005)

Literature has pointed to the lack of recognized resource tenure and incentives for community members to engage and invest in community forest management in the Philippines (O’Hara, 2005; and Borlagdan, et al, 2000). IIRR’s published studies have also indicated that for communities to gain the right to utilize and manage the forests sustainably and legally is beyond their reach financially (acquiring needed documents), time-wise (untimely since documentation is needed on a yearly basis leaving little time for forest utilization), and technically (i.e. DENR forestry related policies require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and technical forest inventory of scientific standards from the community before the granting of user rights). Accordingly, IIRR’s (2005) research also indicates that the advancement of community forestry is hindered by the mere fact that forestry policies in the Philippines focus on directing communities in the management of forest, rather than allowing communities to decide how to manage them.

Moving from the forest to the coastal environment, policy becomes very complicated. Regulations relating to the management of the coastal zone are generally incorporated in broad environmental laws related to environmental impact assessment and pollution control laws. In 1991, Congress passed the RA 7160, also known as the Local Government Code (LGC) of 1991. The law gives local government units (LGUs) primary control over marine and coastal resources. Additionally, community participation in policy and program formulation was institutionalized with the promulgation of Executive Order (EO) 240 (1995) that mandated the formation of local Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Committees (FARMCs) in coastal *barangays*, cities and municipalities, thus, decentralizing control and recognizing the rights of local communities to directly manage the resources and or actively participate in coastal resource management and fisheries related decision-making processes. In 1998, Congress passed two significant laws: the new Fisheries Code (RA 8550) and the

Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act or AFMA (RA 8435) which incorporate measures to curb overexploitation and to manage resources sustainably.

Institutionally, the DENR has been mandated with the overall responsibility for environmental protection and management of both marine and coastal environment, while the Department of Agriculture (DA) has been mandated jurisdiction over the conservation and proper use of agricultural and fishery resources. Under its Fisheries Sector Program (FSP), now Fishery Resources Management Program (FRMP), the DA has implemented a management system known as Coastal Resources Management Project (CRMP). The LGUs, by virtue of the LGC of 1991, had been given the exclusive authority to grant fishery privileges in the municipal waters – up to 15 kilometers. Likewise, the regional government in autonomous regions under the Organic Act of Muslim Mindanao (RA 6734) has been given full control over natural resources management, except for some strategic resources within protected areas. Within this plethora of institutional arrangements, literature indicates that existing institutional set ups are complex, confusing, and ‘sectoralized’. Furthermore, current institutional set-ups are said to be fragmented and inconsistent with the national legal system, thus, causing a major systemic hindrance to more effective management of the marine and coastal resources (La Viña, 2000; and Fellizar, Bernardo and Stuart, 1997). However, literature also indicates that even in the face of ‘inconsistency’ within the national legal system, community-based coastal resource management can thrive despite various environmental management and social development barriers (La Viña, 2000).

Often considered implicit, refined and participatory, governance ‘structures’ covering the Philippine mangrove forests still impede CBNRM-driven rehabilitation efforts and sustainable utilization patterns. Two major forms of ‘co-management’ governance regimes are being employed in the country relative to the conservation, management and restoration/rehabilitation of the mangrove forests; (1) the establishment of a protected area; and (2) a production sharing/management agreement between the community and the government for 25 years (renewable for an additional 25 years) known as a Community Based Forest Management Agreement (CBFMA) - an agreement similar in framework as its upland counterpart (Melana, et al, 2000).

The CBFMA requires the resident community to be organized and represented legally, and this entity becomes the holder of the CBFMA. Community representation is then tasked with the responsibility of assist the government in the protection, rehabilitation, utilization, management and conservation of a specific portion of mangrove forestland in a manner consistent with the principles of sustainable development pursuant to a Community Resource Management Framework (CRMF) by virtue of DENR Administrative Order (DAO) 96-29 (Melana et al, 2000). It is important to note that the CBFMA requires a Resource Use Plan (RUP), often including reforestation plans; however, in the instance that a community formulates their RUP to include sustainable cutting/harvesting of any mangrove trees planted by the community or not, the CBFMA application will be turned down – with the exception of planted nipa and thinning processes related to forest plantations via special permission from the DENR. Accordingly, if a community does enter into a CBFMA, after a planted mangrove tree reaches 15 years of age, the RUP guidelines for utilization under Section 5 – DAO 10, Series 1998, comes into effect which eliminates all forms of mangrove tree cutting for any purpose - planted or not. Subsequently, literature points to these regulations as barriers to communities undertaking mangrove reforestation efforts and the establishment of formal user and community management rights over this resource base (Solar, 2005).

Culminating in 2003, a survey from a ‘grassroots perspective’ was conducted throughout the Philippines in relation to the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA 8550) – a Code that stipulates how fisheries and aquatic resources are to be managed and utilized. From an environmental management perspective, RA 8550 could be considered ‘sound’ in context. However, on the side of social development and social equity – that of which is stressed in CBNRM frameworks – there are recurring

themes that need to be addressed. These include issues relating to the non-recognition of women as major stakeholder in the fisheries sector; the importation exemptions to institutional buyers via Fisheries Administrative Order (FAO) 195; CBCRM not being considered as an integral fisheries management strategy; legal encroachment of the commercial fisheries sector within 10.1 – 15.0 kilometer zone of municipal waters; the absence of protection for community law enforcers within the Code against Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (SLAPP) (i.e. harassment cases filed against law enforcers whether they are government agents or not); and the lack of tenurial instruments and financial support for communities managing and protecting marine sanctuaries (De la Paz, 2003). Other literature points to political discourse within the enforcement of national laws and the lack of policy on territorial use rights. Within small fishing communities, local politics still causes disunity and community-based resource management problems because various community members support different politicians or have different political godfathers (La Viña, 2000; Dizon and Miranda, 1995; and Janiola, *unpublished*).

#### **e. Policy and CBNRM in China**

Scaling out and scaling up CBNRM doctrines in China has proven to be difficult at best as a result of policy and institutional barriers. Literature encompassing CBNRM implementation and research in China has shown that local institutions are essential for sustainable natural resource management; capacity building of farmers is the basis for institutional development; and that a supportive institutional environment for collective actions of local communities is key for developing sustainable community-based institutions (Yuan and Sun, 2004).

In China, government is stratified in five levels: national, provincial, prefecture, county, and township. There are many line agencies and so-called 'special programs' being heavily bureaucratic, and decision-making is top-down. There is very little space for villagers to influence policy-making and policy implementation. Government is also said to have a preference for large-scale 'demonstration' type projects because they are perceived to generate quick economic gains. Noting that environmental considerations remain a secondary priority of government, or ignored altogether. Although the central government is developing more people-oriented programs, projects and activities through adopted policy supporting poverty-alleviation planning, an autonomy law, and other people-centered guidelines (Sun Qui, 2001), institutional operations often do not include monitoring and evaluation guidelines for tracking project and policy guidelines. As an example, the performance evaluation system of government officials in China deem officials accountable only to higher ranks of government. Subsequently, policy direction and institutional thought from national to provincial levels is often said to be a hindrance to CBNRM interventions. The following is a case example:

A research team in 2003 from the Guizhou Academy of Agricultural Sciences (GAAS) began implementing a biogas production project in Changshun, Guizhou Province, China, in response to widespread deforestation in the local area. The project experienced a 'policy barrier' in relation to the government's preference for large scale projects. Although the project was originally set to target a small segment of a local community, policy dictated that 70 percent of households in each natural village and 70 percent of the natural villages in each administrative unit had to be involved in the project, on the assumption that the project will only be technically successful if at least 70 percent of households use the produced gas. Additionally, each household was required to raise three pigs, in order to generate the amount of manure needed to produce the gas. Hence, for the poor villagers of Chaoshan, policy conditions were difficult to comply with; just as difficult as it was for the county to facilitate needed acquisitions. Demonstration units were established; however, without governmental support for maintaining the units, the success of the project was very limited, i.e. the lack of monitoring and evaluation relative to project performance and success judged primarily on project completions (Yuan and Sun, 2004).

From a broader perspective, environmental protection respective of 'forest conservation' in China is focused around the Natural Forest Protection Program and Upland Conversion Program (Ting, Z., 2002), while 'marine conservation' focuses around the Marine Environmental Protection Law (Chen and Uitto, 2003). Although currently, the environmental protection system is managed centrally, it is envisioned that in the future, more interaction with rural people will take place. Additionally, public involvement and participation have also been proposed as policy measures for strengthening environmental protection. However, given that within the vast and diverse areas of China, and in particular Yunnan Province, literature reviewed consistently points out that local adaptability and flexibility respective of 'policy' needed to facilitate environmental protection initiatives are not in place. Additionally, the capacity of local institutions is inadequate, and there is an absence of local incentives to implement environmental protection laws available in the context of CBNRM frameworks (Chen and Uitto, 2003; Qiao, 1997; Ting, Z., 2002; Economy, 1997; and Marks, 2000).

#### **f. Policy and CBNRM in Bhutan**

In Bhutan, the king is head of state, and governance of forest and water resources under state ownership are devolved to an elected Council of Ministers with little widespread community involvement in management processes (DRDS 2002). Community-based forestry in principle was initiated when the Department of Forestry (DoF) was instructed to prepare a program on social forestry involving local people to plant trees in their own private or village land. In 1993, the DoF decentralized people's participation in forest conservation and management along with private and community forestry programs to district authorities for implementation. Although the Forest and Nature Conservation Act of 1995 provides a legal basis for community participation in forest resource planning and management, and policy and frameworks have been put in place, community forestry has not been widely implemented. In part, the DoF embarked on policy implementation slowly because they were unconvinced that communities have the capacity to manage the resources well and feared that over-exploitation would result since there were no examples of 'official' community forestry practice in Bhutan aside from customary management regimes. In addition, most forestry officials were trained to operate under conventional centralized management practices and had not been exposed to participatory community forest management practices. Partnered to this problem base, communities doubted whether they would be granted ownership of their forest plantations (Duba and Ghimiray, 2004). Although policy is in place to ensure that collective ownership and user rights are assured, citizens seeking to reinstate their private management rights to forest plots (i.e. *sokshings*) is still a point of conflict in Bhutan (Pain, A., and Pema, D., 2002).

The most widespread forest management institution in Bhutan is the *sokshing*. *Sokshings* are plots of forest specifically managed by an individual or family for the production of leaf litter and minor amounts of fuelwood (Wangchuk, 2001; Dorji, 2003; Dorji, Webb and Shivakoti, 2003). Formulated policies in relation to the nationalization of Bhutan's forests extended to *sokshings* and immediately changed the property rights and user regimes over these subsistence forest plots from full ownership, management and utilization to appropriation and utilization restricted to being a source of leaf litter and fodder. Hence, the owner has no right over the standing trees and land over which the *sokshing* is established (Dorji, Webb and Shivakoti, 2003; and Schlager, E., and E. Ostrom, 1992). It is important to note that change in forest policy has resulted in behavior shifts towards the value of *sokshings*. Under conditions where the *sokshings* have little productive value, such may be converted into productive agricultural plots. This thought process coupled to 'policy' has spurred proprietors not to managed their forest plots appropriately, if not accelerating degradation purposefully, in hopes for better economic returns from their forest plots being converted to agricultural use in the future (Webb and Dorji, 2004).

The question of forestry and agricultural 'policy' in Bhutan being facilitative or not of CBNRM frameworks is perplexing, and to date, grossly understudied and represented in CBNRM literature.

Literature available in reference to Bhutan's forestry policy seems favorable; however, its inclusive nature of governance does not address issues of social equity strongly felt and expressed in Duba and Ghimiray's (2004) case study 'Walking the Extra Mile'. Duba and Ghimiray state clearly that tensions arose between members of community-based forest user groups due to inequities in power and social relations in the community where prestigious, influential and better-off community members influenced the function of the groups and implementation of community forestry activities. It was noted that some households within the user groups dropped out, and female members of the Community Forestry Management Group committee left. The case study also notes that some critics have argued that CBNRM processes in Bhutan mirror social hierarchies within communities and exacerbate inequity in access to resources (Beck and Nesmith, 2001).

Literature presented in this section indicates commonalities in CBNRM policy related barriers throughout all the countries reviewed. It is commonly noted that decentralization and devolution policies seemingly strengthen the local elite rather than strengthening equitability among NRM stakeholders; new policies adopted often run counter to informal policies; national NRM policy often conflicts with local governance policy respective of collective rights and ownership vs. private rights and ownership over the natural resource base; and there is an absence of formal policy to recognize and legitimize 'community' as a true entity in NRM with rights and secure tenure over the natural resource base. Generally, policy barriers are hardest felt at the ground level where its impact is hugely encountered as part of daily living. Thus, it is also at this level – field level – where approaches to overcoming these barriers emerge. Most often, those who are faced with such barriers explore various avenues toward sensible and practical policy changes. This is where different policy processes and advocacy initiatives come into play.

## **V. Review of CBNRM policy advocacy processes employed by field based practitioners**

The current status of CBNRM policy advocacy has been built on two central assumptions drawn into context – the first being that of 'power-bases' where it was thought that the devolution of authority, responsibility and funding capability (i.e. power) by central government to regional and local institutions and organizations would give greater power over natural resource management to those people in most direct contact with the resources; the second, when those people most directly in contact with natural resources have the power to decide how to manage them and have viable economic alternatives to exploitation, they will promote the conservation of those resources and, thus, reduce threats to environmental stability (Brosius et al, 1998).

Building actively upon the aforementioned assumptions, policy advocacy in Asia diverged from advocacy for nature and advocacy for people in an attempt to demonstrate the relationship between environmental degradation and issues of social justice, rural poverty and indigenous rights (Bonner, 1993; Broad, 1994; and Hitchcock 1995). This indicates that CBNRM is emerging as a political process, one that involves shifts in power away from the powerful to community-based coalitions. Now active are several tracks of policy advocacy accelerated by regional non-governmental organizations working in part with local groups and communities, and in part with national and transnational organizations to promote, build and extend new versions of environmental and social advocacy that link social justice and environmental management into one agenda.

CBNRM policy advocacy is not just about policy change or adoption, but more so about encouraging the adoption/mainstreaming of the CBNRM platform (scaling out), and the appropriate implementation of such through bottom-up policy developments and policy adjustments (scaling up). Meeting this 'mandate', various **supportive and engagement** CBNRM policy advocacy strategies have emerged and fall with the context of 5 general tracks of action utilized within most thematic areas, and often in tandem with one another. Often these strategies address similar issue bases, but the processes in

which they are employed varies greatly respective of frameworks and tools utilized. For organizational purpose and ease of presentation in this review, these ‘tracks of action’ have been given a titled, described in brief, followed by a narrative review of <sup>2</sup>focal examples based on published literature and invited perspectives from field-based CBNRM practitioners through South and Southeast Asia.

For reference, field-based (sometimes known as practice-based) CBNRM policy advocacy centered on two forms (1) supportive approaches that have been titled as a) strengthening of local voices; b) lateral approach; and, to a lesser degree, c) communication development strategy, and (2) engagement approaches – titled as e) research/science driven, and f) transformational.

#### **a. Focal Supportive CBNRM Policy Advocacy Strategies**

Supportive initiatives include those that prepare communities to meaningfully support both ‘advocacy’ for CBNRM adoption laterally via grassroots participatory extension initiatives, and vertically at local and, in some cases, provincial levels via empowering people’s organizations through capability and capacity building. For reference purposes in this literature review, these initiatives will be referred to as ‘Strengthening of Local Voices’.

The premise behind the CBNRM policy advocacy initiative ‘Strengthening of Local Voices’ is to prepare communities to meaningfully support both ‘advocacy’ for CBNRM adoption laterally via grassroots participatory extension initiatives, and vertically at local and, in some cases, provincial levels by empowering people’s organizations through capability and capacity building. This approach to policy advocacy also has elements in common with the ‘Lateral Approach’ and, at times, these overlap each other through purposeful amalgamation in capability and capacity building endeavors.

The Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) in Cambodia is an example of how capability and capacity building within communities can strengthen local voices and result in the creation of opportunities for policy reform in community forestry (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004).

*“This is the first time that I saw a forester come to work with the local people”.*

Mr. Noun, Cambodian Chumkiri elder - (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004)

The CFRP utilized village-based study tours for community members in other parts of Cambodia to learn about positive community forestry experiences and the use of tools, such as land use mapping, to strengthen their position in becoming local stewards of their surrounding natural resource base. By visiting, discussing and solving problems together, villagers enriched their understanding of community forestry and gained interest in formalizing their own community forestry initiatives. The process was followed by cultivating a multi-disciplinary and multi-level cooperation between different actors respective of capability and capacity building, thus, allowing for the recognition and understanding of differing values, roles and relationships held by different actors (community members and local and provincial officials etc.). CFRP researchers have indicated the process to be instrumental in facilitating a stronger role for communities in forestry-sector reforms. Additionally, in linking ‘field-based’ community forestry learning with institutional and policy development processes, such becomes a mechanism for bridging gaps between community and national levels and the strengthening of local voices to actively partake in policy reform processes (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004).

---

<sup>2</sup> These focal examples are seen as key experiences that will lend to the Exploring Regional CBNRM Policy Advocacy Workshop to be held February 6<sup>th</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006 at IIRR, Philippines, where firsthand field-based CBNRM policy advocacy initiatives in 6 selected South and Southeast Asian countries are to be further documented and discussed.

Turning to the Philippines, another good example of ‘Strengthening of Local Voices’ initiative is provided by Rambaldi, Bugna, Tiangco and De Vera (2002). In this case study, entitled ‘Bringing the Vertical Dimension to the Negotiating Table’, 3-D community based mapping processes helped in addressing boundary issues in support of DAO 2, Series 1993 (1993) that seeks to recognize, identify and delineate areas occupied by indigenous people, thus, strengthening the community position in policy reform and implementation processes. Critical components of the process were capacity building, organizational strengthening, conflict management and resolution and process documentation.

As part of the capacity building component, a training program on community land use planning and participatory 3-D modeling was designed in coordination with the Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID) (Tiangco, 2000). Successful in its application for resolving boundary conflicts, the framework of the Integrated Conflict Resolution and Management Program now supports the construction of community participatory 3-D models in other municipalities in the Cordillera as a valid community-driven decision-making/mitigation process (Rambaldi, Bugna, Tiangco and De Vera, 2002).

Supportive initiatives also extend to local government units (LGUs), where efforts are focused on preparing local government entities to deal with ‘decentralization’ and power ‘devolution’ from two perspectives: one, developing LGU ability to work with communities through functional CBNRM relationships; and two, developing LGU ability to engage meaningfully with higher levels of governance in support of CBNRM platforms (i.e. a Lateral Approach). To demonstrate this approach, a brief overview of two studies is presented, the first by Van Tuyen et al, (2004) – Participatory Local Planning for Resource Governance in Tam Giang Lagoon, Vietnam; and the second highlights an initiative in the Philippines by the Institute of Social Order (ISO), in which the ‘Lateral Approach’ is amalgamated with that of ‘Strengthening of Local Voices’ to influence and improve decision-making processes within local governance structures (Survey response – Philippines – ISO).

Lateral CBNRM policy advocacy approaches are highly dependent on establishing functional relationships between stakeholders – functional meaning facilitative through collaborative action. The Tam Giang Lagoon case study indicates that local fishers and farmers, government officials from the Provincial Department of Fisheries (DoF) and the academe (faculty members of Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry (HUAFF) and Hue University of Sciences (HUS)), jointly undertook a series of collaborative learnings and testing of CBNRM conflict interventions over a period of several years. Collaborative learning included participatory research approaches, CBNRM orientations and gender sensitivity, among other tools and methods. Conflict interventions tested resulted in a waterway management plan for the lagoon through co-management processes that is said to have contributed to reforms in the Fishery Law of 2003 (Van Tuyen et al, 2004).

The aforementioned processes spurred local government units to learn how to work effectively with communities from a community perspective and to better understand policy conflicts and environmental degradation in relation to tenure and natural resource production systems. Key to this achievement was a common understanding of CBNRM approaches developed among the stakeholders through research and experimentation, subsequently resulting in the recognition of customary access rights, changes in process relative to local planning and resource governance, and role modification of the key stakeholders (i.e. local government providing legal and organizing support for the implementation of joint plans, and officers of provincial and district government departments provided technical assistance instead of giving direct instructions) (Van Tuyen et al, 2004).

The Institute of Social Order in the Philippines has been active in the ‘lateral’ policy advocacy approach in amalgamation with ‘Strengthening of Local Voices’ policy advocacy initiatives that have resulted in communities instituting changes in local governance within the coastal and fisheries sector.



The Institute actively works under a tripartite framework (LGU-NGO-PO) as a facilitator and trainer for both communities and local government representatives in building both technical coastal resource management capabilities and fostering ‘field-based’ understandings between stakeholders through joint training processes. The use of Participatory Action Research (PAR) is also employed in a manner that highlights local environmental management abilities and equitable social development (ISO, 2000; and Solar, 2005).

Beginning in 1997, ISO began to fortify its tripartite approach in the coastal sector by conducting multi-stakeholder socio-ecological resource assessment trainings and PAR discussion forums resulting in a supportive system of CBCRM co-management throughout several municipalities in Camarines Norte and Quezon provinces where LGU facilitated policy initiatives (e.g. protected area establishments, unified multi-municipality fisheries monitoring ordinances, and, at the time of writing, the development of a cross-municipal ordinance respective of gear usage is being processed) stemming from community actions, community perspectives and collective community decision-making processes (ISO, 2000, and Survey response – Philippines – ISO).

Communication Development Strategy, as it is commonly known, is yet another supportive initiative of CBNRM policy advocacy invoking ‘communication’ processes in capability and capacity building measures to facilitate CBNRM policy engagements among people’s organizations (POs), non-government organizations (NGOs) and government entities; notably, few are field-based initiatives.

‘Communication Development Strategy’, as it is commonly known, is yet another supportive initiative of CBNRM policy advocacy invoking varied ‘communication’ processes in capability and capacity building measures to facilitate CBNRM policy engagements among POs, NGOs and government entities. Although this policy advocacy strategy is often centered on upper levels of NRM governance to facilitate CBNRM processes, organizations, such as LIBIRD (Local Initiatives for Biodiversity and Development) in Nepal, have employed the use of rural radio programs (LI-BIRD KO Chautari) to raise awareness levels relating to CBNRM policy barriers. This program is said to be effective in sensitizing different stakeholders on conservation, sustainable utilization of natural resources, and the benefits of community based natural resource management. LI-BIRD also addresses national level decision-making processes by facilitating local level participation in public awareness venues, policy briefs and policy research processes (Survey response – Nepal – LI-BIRD).

The Asia Forest Network (AFN) supports the role of communities in protection and sustainable use of forests through regional exchanges on community forestry processes, and uses field visits built into regional meetings as a ‘Communication Development Strategy’, since these are viewed as opportunities for NRM policymakers to be exposed to and learn from local community forestry experiences, and to influence their ‘mental’ orientation relative to CBNRM processes and needs, such as field based Community Forestry (CF) reorientation training and policy reform. This is demonstrated in an AFN-ESSC (2001) case study situated in the municipality of Candijay, Bohol, Philippines. The case study is noteworthy as it also illustrates that the ‘strategy’ could also influence and further educate those implementing the strategy.

*“I had the simplistic idea that once you identify the right mechanism and right group, everything would work out. Changing memberships, projects coming and going in Cadapdapan as in other places in South Asia, indicate that this is very dynamic, because motivations of different people are different. Our strategies must change with changing memberships and dynamics”.*

(Mark Poffenberger – AFN 2001)

The Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC) in Thailand employs communication development strategies in the form of promoting analysis and representation of policy options to support CBNRM at the international, as well as national level, through engagement in key international forum (e.g. IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy; ASEAN Social Forestry Network; and the ITTO Civil Society Advisory Group), and by creating neutral spaces for dialogue with government agencies such as the Community Forestry Forum (Survey response – Thailand RECOFTC).

#### **b. Focal Engagement CBNRM Policy Advocacy Strategies**

Although the focus of this section is on ‘field-based’ CBNRM policy advocacy strategies, it is relevant to note that ‘engagement’ strategies also encompass networks and coalitions on provincial, regional and national scales. Provincial networks aim to fortify and unite local level POs and NGOs in both ‘scaling out’ and ‘scaling up’ endeavors, targeting CBNRM implementation barriers through policy advocacy at the municipal level. Their activities once again include capability and capacity building, in addition to establishing informative platforms where particular CBNRM actors, including local level and regional power players, come together, share their experiences, and discuss issues related to policy and CBNRM technical backstopping. Reflecting this process, regional and national NGO networks and coalitions focus on ‘scaling up’ and fortifying networks, in part through capacity building, and in part by establishing platforms where NRM policy- and CBNRM policy-related issues stemming from national levels of natural resource governance can be discussed, debated, influenced and, in some cases, reformulated.

Two other ‘engagement’-related CBNRM policy advocacy strategies exist. These are aimed, more so, to influence NRM policies through direct channels with policymakers. The first is Research/Science Driven policy advocacy, based in everything from anthropological, social and political studies to that which encompasses economics and ecology. These disciplines are used not only to analyze the affects of national NRM policy at local levels, but also offer science-based solutions directly to decision-makers for processing.

In recent years, ‘Research/Science Driven’ policy advocacy, classically known as ‘policy research’, has evolved into more of a community-based approach – that which is embedded in participatory approaches, e.g. participatory action research (PAR) – combining empirical research by ‘formally trained’ NRM practitioners and the community perspective of such through experimentation and participation. Duba and Ghimiray (2004) provide insight into this form of CBNRM policy advocacy through their PAR in Bhutan. The project is presented below in narrative form.

Historically in Bhutan, research and development on natural resources was sector-specific, commodity and discipline-focused, and researcher-led, with little community involvement. The Renewable Natural Resource Research Center (RNRRC) of the Ministry of Agriculture, located in Bajo, piloted a watershed community-based natural resource management project focusing on improving resource productivity, as well as people’s livelihoods, through integrating natural resource management

with the participation of local communities. The project involved a participatory and cross-sectoral approach to diagnose problems, as well as to plan and implement necessary CBNRM related interventions, in conjunction with conventional research on-station.

Major problems within the research site extend from poor watershed conditions affecting, in part, water availability leading to conflicts over water use and shortage of irrigation water for rice cultivation, to declining soil fertility leading to low and unstable crop yields (RNRRC, 1997). As various CBNRM interventions led to an improved resource base (water, forest, soils, crops etc.), improved productivity and enhanced benefits from these resources ensued. Duba and Ghimiray (2004) noted that through the implementation of CBNRM interventions and participatory action research in the field, such had influenced changes within the Bajo Research Centre and within Bhutan's agricultural research sector – i.e. shifting the focus of research programs towards more holistic and community-centered integrated methods. Based on the successes of this program, Duba and Ghimiray (2004) indicated that CBNRM approaches have been increased nationally within the nation's research system and through the CBNRM national policy framework.

The Sustainable Agriculture & Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research Support Program (SANREM-CRSP) utilizes research-driven policy advocacy initiatives to assist in the analysis, creation and successful application of decision support methods, institutional innovations and local capacity approaches that foster participatory sustainable agriculture and natural resource planning, management and policy analysis at local, municipal, provincial and national levels (Buenavista, 2003). Using SANREM's experiences in the Philippines, outlined below are three interdependent strategies that guided SANREM's efforts to link research and policy advocacy in Lantapan – a major municipality bordering a national protected area in the province of Bukidnon.

1. The creation of a social environment for research and stakeholder interactions to occur. This included consultative phases with community groups, participation in municipal meetings, and the creation of a community advisory council within the SANREM Philippines management structure to ensure local representation in programmatic decisions. Research results were explained to the Lantapan community by means of informal gatherings and dialogue.
2. Capacity building for communities and local government directed towards municipal or provincial governments, community-based groups and other local stakeholders to actively partake in research processes. For example, at the community level, SANREM trained water quality monitoring volunteers, an initiative that led to the formation of a registered NGO now playing an active role in advocating for policy change and serving as resource persons in municipal and national policy dialogues.
3. Conduct demand-driven research and policy advocacy, coupled to training for local government officials in policy needs and concerns vis-à-vis more powerful stakeholders.

The SANREM CRSP - Lantapan experience indicates that through practice, the use of research process as a means to bring together multiple stakeholders and enhance local capabilities and capacities through participation in research is viable. The project also illustrates how a research product can be used to generate public awareness, institutionalize mechanisms for community-based dialogue, guide decision makers and influence policy and action on larger and longer scales (Buenavista, 2003).

The second direct form of CBNRM policy advocacy engagement comes from a very different perspective -- that of revealing the 'realities' of NRM policy at the local level directly to those involved in the formulation and implementation of NRM policies, i.e. known as Transformational Policy Advocacy,

sometimes coined Linking People to Policy. Notably, this is different from what is often perceived as ‘confrontational street advocacy’. This is an initiative that encompasses the creation of a platform for equitable and meaningful dialogue between high-ranking NRM policy makers, NRM implementers and local community members.

Transformational policy advocacy is a direct form of CBNRM policy advocacy engagement from a different perspective than that of ‘Research/Science Driven’ process. This initiative focuses on revealing the ‘realities’ of NRM policy at the local level directly to those involved in the formulation and implementation of NRM policies. In many aspects, this form of CBNRM policy advocacy is common throughout South Asia and Southeast Asia, where community members are invited to present and/or partake in NRM related conferences. However, in recent years, transformational policy advocacy has taken on a more deliberate form of action – a platform focused on equitable and meaningful dialogue between high-ranking NRM policy makers, NRM implementers and local community members, i.e. linking people to policy

A prominent example of this CBNRM policy advocacy initiative is clearly presented in a publication by IIRR (2005) entitled Linking People to Policy. IIRR provides concerned entities a supportive and facilitative venue for constructive discourse (e.g. conferences, seminars, forums etc.), which is also an avenue for advocacy. The basis of this advocacy platform can be viewed as an informal extension of research/science driven policy advocacy; however, rather than researchers presenting empirical evidence on behalf of community members, community members present their own evidence and opinions directly to those responsible for policy making. The process is as follows:

**1) Listen first:**

All groups of actors (NRM policy makers, NRM implementers and local community members etc.) have an equal opportunity to present their opinions and the justifications behind these in the form of presentations based on their papers. No interruption or verbal questions beyond clarification questions are allowed. Feedback questions and comments are written on cards and pinned on display boards for the presenter to read afterwards. Subsequently, groups are given time to synthesize feedbacks before the next step of the process.

**2) Constructive confrontation:**

Debate is then organized in such a manner that provides space for all groups to separately present key position statements and justify their positions on key barriers to an initiative (e.g. community forestry), receive critique and seek consensus. Identification of issues where consensus could not be found are brought to the next step of the process.

**3) Struggle for compromise:**

Small multi-stakeholder groups are formed and tasked to find compromise and/or accommodation for issues that still need resolution.

(IIRR, 2005)

As previously mentioned, CBNRM policy related barriers within the Philippine forestry sector encompass financial, time-bound, and technical processes. When the aforementioned ‘Linking People to Policy’ initiative was applied in the Philippines in 2002, parties were able to agree in principle that “utilization permits under Community-Based Forest Management should be reviewed and simplified to be more appropriate for community members.” This, among other agreed upon recommendations, has been translated into revisions in the Philippine CBFM Guidelines (IIRR, 2005).

Literature cited in this review indicates that action research, as a tool, can link local communities to those that influence policy directly. John and Phalla's case study (2004) on CBNRM and decentralized governance in Ratanakiri, Cambodia illustrates that action research undertaken in close collaboration with community members and provincial authorities helped the province develop procedures for participatory land use planning that empowered community members to negotiate from a better position. At the same time, it helped build the capacity of government at the provincial and local levels for decentralized natural resource management. Seemingly, this process mirrors the efforts of ISO in the Philippines (the amalgamation of 'Strengthening of Local Voices' and the 'Lateral Approach'); however, the process is taken a step further by incorporating segments of 'policy negotiation' that culminated in agreements on resource management processes between communities and the provincial government, and the recognition of resource tenure and rights of indigenous peoples. John and Phalla (2004) have contributed the successes of the action research project to the strong involvement of indigenous communities in Ratanakiri Province via directly helping government entities to understand issues faced by indigenous people, thus, linking people to policy.

Clearly the use of participatory action research (PAR) comes into use in many, if not all of the 5 general tracks of CBNRM policy advocacy strategies reviewed. Presented below in Table 1 and Table 2 are matrixes that depict not only where elements of PAR research fall within differing CBNRM policy advocacy strategies, but other processes, actions, and tools reviewed as well.

**Table 1.** Focal supportive CBNRM policy advocacy strategies employed in selected South and Southeast Asian countries.

Section Reference	Principle Issue/s Targeted	Processes / Tools / Actions Employed	Featured Outcomes
<b>Strengthening of Local Voices</b>			
<b>Cambodia</b> - Strengthening local voices to inform national policy... (Kamnap and Ramony, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non-responsive and inequitable community forest governance processes</li> <li>- Socio-cultural gaps between community and national level perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participatory Action Research (PAR)</li> <li>- Multi-disciplinary and multi-level cooperation</li> <li>- Linking field learning to institutional policy development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthening of community forestry policies (sub-decrees) and their implementation</li> <li>- Expansion of community forestry</li> <li>- Increased well-being of community forest users, e.g. increased food security, cohesion of community, and established function linkages between community and government</li> </ul>
<b>Philippines</b> – Bringing the Vertical Dimension to the Negotiating Table (Rambaldi, Bugna, Tiangco and De Vera, 2002).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor implementation of Certificates of Ancestral Domain Claims (CADCs) vis-à-vis inequitable boundary delineations and boundary disputes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity building</li> <li>- Organizational strengthening</li> <li>- Conflict management and resolution</li> <li>- Process documentation</li> <li>- 3-D modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundaries redefined</li> <li>- Improved communications amongst communities and government</li> <li>- Granting of equitable CADCs</li> </ul>
<b>Lateral Approach Strategy</b>			
<b>Vietnam</b> - Participatory Local Planning for Resource Governance in Tam Giang Lagoon, Vietnam (Van Tuyen et al, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overexploitation and degradation of the natural resource base</li> <li>- Inequitable distribution of benefits derived from natural resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joint participatory research between farmers, fishers, and government officials (PAR, REA, PRA etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot implementation of a new model for participatory planning and resource co-management</li> <li>- Resolved conflicts –increased equitable access to natural resource</li> <li>- Common understanding of the CBNRM approaches developed among stakeholders</li> <li>- Recognition of customary access rights, changes to local planning processes</li> </ul>

<b>Philippines</b> - Participatory socio-ecological coastal resource assessment – inter-island community-based coastal resource management profile and training... (ISO, 2000, and survey response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overexploitation and degradation of the natural resource base</li> <li>- Inequitable distribution of benefits derived from natural resources</li> <li>- Poor local government support for action</li> <li>- Poor decision-making processes within local governance structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joint tripartite (LGU-NGO-PO) participatory research between farmers, fishers, and government officials (PAR, REA, PRA etc.)</li> <li>- Localized tripartite CBNRM capability and capacity building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive system of CBCRM co-management</li> <li>- Improved decision-making processes within local governance structures</li> <li>- Increased welfare within communities (community empowerment – self directed - stakeholder supported, economic improvement, ecological recovery, environmental protection and preservation)</li> </ul>
<b>Communication Development Strategy</b>			
<b>Nepal</b> – Local Initiatives for Biodiversity and Development (LIBIRD) (survey response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barriers to community access, control and benefit sharing of common property resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Publicizing issues through media and publication materials</li> <li>- Networking and coordination among stakeholders</li> <li>- Participatory research</li> <li>- GO-NGO partnership building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sensitized stakeholders relative to natural resource conservation and sustainable utilization of natural resource</li> </ul>
<b>Philippines</b> – Upland and lowland resource use in the Municipality of Candijay, Bohol... (AFN & ESSC, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overexploitation and degradation of the natural resource base</li> <li>- Inequitable distribution of benefits derived from natural resources</li> <li>- Inconsistent guidelines on natural resource use</li> <li>- Lack of support for formal community based law enforcement</li> <li>- Negative impact of foreign-assisted reforestation projects on natural dipterocarp species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building community based field visits into regional multi-stakeholder meetings</li> <li>- Field-based Community Forestry (CF) reorientation training and policy reform sessions for government support agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes in community perceptions relative to their rights and responsibilities as stewards of their natural environment</li> <li>- Innovative management strategies based on community resources</li> </ul>
<b>Thailand</b> – Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC ) (survey response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gaps in equitable community participation relative to the direction of CBFM decision making processes and CBNRM approaches at regional and national levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote analysis and representation of policy options in support of CBNRM in national and international forums</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants in regional forums are consistently able to interact and share challenges and successes with each other, gaining insight and new ideas for community forestry policy formulation and implementation processes</li> </ul>

**Table 2.** Focal engagement CBNRM policy advocacy strategies employed in selected South and Southeast Asian countries.

Section Reference	Principle Issue/s Targeted	Processes / Tools / Actions Employed	Featured Outcomes
<b>Research/Science Driven Strategy</b>			
<b>Bhutan –</b> Walking the extra mile: from field learning to natural resource management research and policy... (Duba and Ghimiray, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non responsive NRM development processes</li> <li>- NRM research and development sector-specific, commodity, and discipline-focused</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration of NRM research with communities (PAR)</li> <li>- Participatory and cross-sectoral research</li> <li>- Planning and implementing of interventions in conjunction with conventional research on-station.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wider adoption of CBNRM platforms</li> <li>- Strengthened social assets within communities and local institutions for planning, implementing, and monitoring of CBNRM progress</li> <li>- CBNRM approaches integrated within the nation's research system and CBNRM national policy framework</li> </ul>
<b>Philippines –</b> Integrating research and policy for natural resource management... SANREM. (Buenavista, 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy makers most often not utilizing scientific information before making decisions</li> <li>- Low appreciation for the values of research</li> <li>- NRM based scientific research often fails to take into account policy makers' needs and their capacity to access and absorb information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of a social environment for research and stakeholder interactions</li> <li>- Capacity building for research - communities and local government units</li> <li>- Conduct demand-driven research and policy advocacy</li> <li>- Training of local government officials in policy needs and concerns vis-à-vis more powerful stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generate public awareness</li> <li>- Institutionalized mechanisms for community-based dialogue</li> <li>- Decision makers guided towards appropriate action and policy influence</li> </ul>
<b>Transformational Strategy</b>			
<b>Philippines –</b> Linking People to Policy... (IIRR, 2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NRM policy and policy implementation procedures within the Philippine forestry sector discourage communities from adopting CB forestry practices</li> <li>- Lack of equitable benefits gained through community forestry management efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of supportive and facilitative venues for constructive discourse directly between those responsible for making and implementing NRM policy and those most affected by such</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholders able to agree in principle that "utilization permits under CBFM should be reviewed and simplified to be more appropriate for community members</li> <li>- CBFM guideline revisions adopted for selected trial areas</li> </ul>
<b>Cambodia –</b> Community-based natural resource management and decentralized governance in Ratanakiri, Cambodia (John, A.J.I. & C. Phalla, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Disconnection between community and national NRM policy needs</li> <li>- Inequitable distribution of benefits derived from natural resources</li> <li>- Non recognition of indigenous community rights and modes of NRM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Action research in collaboration with community and provincial authorities</li> <li>- Capacity building for provincial and local level governments in aspects of decentralized natural resource management</li> <li>- Establishment of 'policy negotiation' venues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provincial guidelines for participatory land use planning</li> <li>- Capacity of provincial and local governments enhanced to facilitate decentralized natural resource management</li> <li>- NRM agreements established between communities and provincial level governments</li> <li>- Recognition of resource tenure and rights of indigenous peoples</li> </ul>

CBNRM policy advocacy platforms take on many supportive and facilitative roles, starting with communities and their ability to engage meaningfully with local and regional officials in policy processes. Initiatives are complemented by efforts aimed to help local governance entities understand and actualize CBNRM platforms as a means to effective and equitable natural resource management and social development within their area of responsibility and beyond. Throughout the literature cited in this review, and the information that has been given through a South Asia and Southeast Asia regional survey conducted for this review, participatory action research, and joint capacity building through field-based action, plays an integral, if not focal roles, in each of the CBNRM policy advocacy forms.

Although the use of PAR as an essential CBNRM policy advocacy tool clearly enhances community and local governance capabilities and capacities to engage in policy reform from the bottom up (Buenavista, 2003), other CBNRM policy advocacy tools and processes do exist, and largely entail the use of ‘communication’ tools. However, the extent to which these tools are employed currently in field-based initiatives is not well known. Given in Annex 1 are some of the more ‘prominent’ CBNRM policy advocacy communication’ tools and processes available through the Internet, among others relevant to CBNRM policy advocacy.

## **VI. Conclusion**

Supporters of CBNRM propound that ‘decentralization’ can foster development policies and strategies suited to local socio-cultural, economic and environmental conditions. However, the underlying principles of decentralization in South and Southeast Asia for countries such as Bhutan, China, Cambodia and Indonesia are still weakly understood, and the capacities for managing the process may still be limited. Literature presented in this review of South Asian and Southeast Asian CBNRM policy and policy advocacy noted that decentralization and devolution policies in many cases resulted in strengthening the local elite rather than strengthening equitability among local resource users and NRM stakeholders. Furthermore the review indicated that interpretations of policy between national NRM governance agencies and local agencies tasked with implementing nationally derived NRM policy is highly problematic with serious inferences on private and collective rights and tenure security over the natural resource base. Perhaps there is a need for ‘socially restructuring’ the process of NRM decentralization, and the behavior in which NRM decision-making occurs.

Literature reviewed also indicted that newly formed policies often run counter to the more traditional forms of local natural resource governance. As important as ‘social restructuring’ may be to policy engagement, supporting and legitimizing traditional/local forms of NRM governance needs to be supported not only through political will, but supported from the ground up to ensure that what is being advocated is founded in coherent, sound, and strategic information. Similarly, policy must also be rational, realistic, and responsive as it is translated from a political form of ‘law’ to a relevant and guided ‘policy’ to a practicable implemented process, ‘action’ and equitable ‘development’. To do so, many questions still need to be resolved. What do we rely upon to influence and shape policy – scientific purity or traditional indigenous and local knowledge systems? micro or macro economic perspectives? and/or national or local interests? Even if we perceive our knowledge bases to be reliable, even understandable when amalgamated, can we ensure coherence between ‘policy options’ pursued at different levels of governance and still be effective in keeping local people involved where the policy agenda is best addressed at the national or international level?

Finally, reviewed literature highlights the absence of formal policy to recognize and legitimize ‘community’ as a true entity in NRM with rights and secure tenure over the natural resource base as a major barrier to scaling out and scaling up CBNRM initiatives, i.e. sound and responsive environmental management and equitable social development. As daunting as this barrier is to be overcome, and the



others mentioned, PAR, and joint capacity building through field-based actions has become an essential tool in CBNRM policy advocacy processes for addressing these barriers.

It is very difficult to define and place CBNRM policy advocacy processes into structured frameworks for blueprint planning and implementation, other than the use of particular tools, such as PAR, that reveal the realities of inadequate, sometimes repressive, and unresponsive nationally-formed NRM policies. Of the five general tracks of CBNRM policy advocacy reviewed in this literature review ('Strengthening of Local Voices', the 'Lateral Approach', and 'Communication Development Strategy'; and the engagement of CBNRM policy advocacy initiatives namely, 'Research / Science Driven', and 'Transformational'), little is still known about the internal workings of each process, how they affect or can affect policy reform on broader scales to address social inequalities and environmental degradation, and how they can be used together to bring about social empowerment.

Literature reviewed, and statements gathered from survey respondents indicate that more is needed in way of research that reveals hidden policy barriers relative to CBNRM implementation, and done so in a manner that can be understood by local people. Accordingly, references have been made for the need to better design research projects geared to influence policy and to find new and innovative ways of using CBNRM policy advocacy tools, such as PAR and capacity building, to identify key actors who influence policy, why policymakers change policy, and how formulated CBNRM policy matches CBNRM implementation.

CBNRM advocates throughout the region are struggling with these dilemmas, often in an isolated manner. When it is considered that the change in a few lines of policy can impact hundreds of thousands of rural poor people, thinking and learning more about how to engage policymakers through CBNRM policy advocacy innovation becomes extremely important.

## VII. References

- Adato, M., T. Besley, L. Haddad & J. Hoddinott. (1999b). *Participation and poverty reduction: issues, theory and new evidence from South Africa*. (mimeo.) Draft background paper for the World Development Report 2000. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- AFN & ESSC. (2001). *Upland and lowland resource use in the Municipality of Candijay, Bohol, Philippines*. Asia Forest Network and the Environmental Science for Social Change.
- Barr, C. & I.A.P. Resosudarmo. (2002). *Decentralisation of forest administration in Indonesia: Implications for forest sustainability, community livelihoods, and economic development*. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Barr, C., E. Wollenberg, G. Limberg, N. Anau, R. Iwan, I.M. Sudana, M. Moeliono, & T. Djogo. (2001). *The impacts of decentralisation on forests and forest dependent communities in Malinau District, East Kalimantan*. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Beck, T. & C. Nesmith. (2001). Building on poor people's capacities: the case of common property resources in India and West Africa. *World Development*, 29(1): 119-133.
- Bhutan. (1997). *8<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan*. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 <http://www.dop.gov.bt/fyp/08/index.htm>
- Bonner, R. (1993). *At the hand of man: Peril and hope for Africa's wildlife*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Borlagdan, S.B. et al. (2001). *Community-based forest management in the Philippines: a preliminary assessment*. Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo De Manila University, Philippines.
- Broad, R. (1994). *The poor and the environment: Friends or foes?* *World Dev.* 22(6):811-822.
- Brosius, J.P. & T.A. Lowenhaupt. (1998, March). Representing communities: histories and politics of community-based natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources*, 11(2).
- Buenavista, G. (2003). *Integrating research and policy for natural resource management: lessons learned in the Philippines*. Sustainable Agriculture & Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research Support Program – Southeast Asia Program, SANREM CRSP, Georgia, USA.
- CBCRM RC. (2001) *Historical overview of community-based coastal resources management*. CBCRM Resource Center, University of the Philippines Social Action Research Development Foundation Inc., University of the Philippines College of Social Work and Community Development and The Ford Foundation Philippines.
- Chen, S. & J. Uitto. (2003). Governing marine and coastal environment in China: building local government capacity through international cooperation. *China Environment Series*, Issue 6.
- Cohen, S. S., J.W. Dyckman, E. Schoenberger, & C.R. Downs. (1981). *Decentralization: a framework for policy analysis*. Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Conyers, D. (1983). Decentralization: the latest fashion in development administration. *Public Administration and Development*, 3(2): 97-109.
- Conyers, D. (1984). Decentralization and development: a review of the literature. *Public Administration and Development*, 4(2): 187-197.
- Dahuri, R. (2001). *The challenges of public policy for sustainable oceans and coastal development: new directions in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the Oceans And Coast For Rio + 10 Conference, Paris, December 2001.

- De la Paz, B. (2003). *Policy challenges in CBCRM (a Grassroots Perspective)*. Preliminary Results of the Consultations held with Small Fisherfolks on the Review of the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA 8550). CBCRM Resource Center, Philippines.
- Dizon, A.M. & G. Miranda. (1995). *The Coastal Resource Management Experience in San Salvador Island*. [www.co-management.org/download/wp23.pdf](http://www.co-management.org/download/wp23.pdf)
- Dorji, L. (2003). *Assessing the evolution, status and future implications of forest resources management in the inner Himalayas of the Kingdom of Bhutan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok.
- Dorji, L., E.L. Webb, & G. Shivakoti. (2003). Can a nationalized forest management system uphold local institutions? A case of leaf litter forest (sokshing) management in Bhutan. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(3): 341-359.
- DRDS. (2002). *Community-based natural resources management in Bhutan: a framework*. Department of Research and Development Services, Ministry of Agriculture, Thimphu, Bhutan.
- Duba, S. & M. Ghimiray. (2004). *Walking the extra mile: from field learning to natural resource management research and policy in Bhutan*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- Economy, 1997. The case study of China: reforms and resources, the implications for state capacity in the PRC. Occasional Paper - *Project on Environmental Scarcities, State Capacity, and Civil Violence*. American Academy of Arts, Cambridge, USA and Sciences and the University of Toronto, Canada.
- FAO. (2003). CBNRM amongst indigenous people in Ratanaki province, in *Communication and Natural Resource Management: Experience – Theory*. Food and Agricultural Administration of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. Pp. 33-40
- Fellizar, F.P., R.G. Bernardo & A.P.H. Stuart. (1997). *Addressing policy needs of fishers and aquatic resources towards sustainable development*. Paper presented during the forum on policy relevant to fisheries and aquatic resource management, SEARCA, UP Los Banos, Laguna, 06 February 1997.
- Gilmour, D. (2002). *Perspective on community forestry and research on Adaptive Collaborative Management*. A presentation to a national workshop on adaptive collaborative management, September 10-11, 2002, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Gilmour, D.A. & R.J. Fisher. (1991). *Villagers, forests and foresters: the philosophy, process and practice of community forestry in Nepal*. Sahayogi Press, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Hanson, A.J., I. Augustine, C.A. Courtney, A. Fauzi, S. Gammage & Koesoebiono. (2003). *Proyek pesisir - an assessment of the coastal resource management project (CRMP) in Indonesia*. Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island, USA.
- Hitchcock, R. 1995. *Centralization, resource depletion, and coercive conservation among the Tyua of the Northeastern Kalahari*. Hum. Ecol. 23(2):169-198.
- HMG. 1998. Local Self Governance Act, 1998. HMG/Nepla . Kathmandu.
- Hoskins, M., and D. Acharya (2004, August). Forest governance and community forestry development in Nepal. *RECOFTC Evaluation Report*. Regional Community Forestry Training Center, Thailand.
- IIRR. (2005). *Linking people to policy: from participation to deliberation in the context of Philippine community Forestry*. International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, Philippines.

- ISO. 2000. *Participatory socio-ecological coastal resource assessment – inter-island community-based coastal resource management profile and training – Municipality of Mercedes, Camarines Norte, Philippines*. Institute of Social Order. Quezon City, Philippines.
- Janiola, Jr. E.S. (undated). *Mangrove Rehabilitation and Coastal Resource Management in Cogtong Bay: Addressing Mangrove Management Issues Through Community Participation*. Unpublished.
- John, A.J.I. & C. Phalla. (2004). *Community-based natural resource management and decentralized governance in Ratanakiri, Cambodia*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- Kamnap P. & S. Ramony. (2004). *Strengthening local voices to inform national policy: community forestry in Cambodia*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- Klooster, D. (2000). Institutional choice, community and struggle: a case study of forest co-management in Mexico. *World Development*, 28(1): 1-20.
- Kompas. (2000). Down to Earth No. 45, May 2000 - <http://dte.gn.apc.org/45CRC.htm>
- La Viña, A.G.M. (2000). *Community-based approaches to marine and coastal resources management in the Philippines: a policy perspective*. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Quezon City, Philippines.
- Landau, M. & E. Eagle. (1981). *On the concept of decentralization*. Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Lindayati, L. (2000). *Community forestry policies in selected Southeast Asian countries*. International Development Research Center, Ottawa.
- Melana, D.M.J., C.E. Atcher III, R.E. Yao, E.E. Melana & H.I. Gonzales. (2000). *Mangrove management handbook*. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines through the Coastal Resource Management Project, Cebu City, Philippines.
- Manor, J. (1999). *The political economy of democratic decentralization*. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Marks, R. B. (2000). Review of Xiaoying Ma and Leonard Ortolano, *Environmental Regulation in China: Institutions, Enforcement, and Compliance*, H-Environment, H-Net Reviews, August, 2000.
- Marschke, M. 2003. From planning to action: what can resources management committees do “on the ground”? *Cambodia Development Review*, 7(3): 7–10, 12.
- Marschke, M., K. Nong & N. Vantha. (2000). *Discovering new lessons: CBCRM in Peam Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary*. Participatory Management of Mangrove Resources Project Team, Koh Kong Province, Cambodia.
- Mawhood, P. & K. Davey. (1980). Anglophone Africa, in D.C. Rowat (ed.) *International Handbook on Local Government Reorganization*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Mawhood, P. (1983). Decentralization: the concept and the practice, in P. Mawhood (ed.) *Local Government in the Third World*. New York: John Wiley.
- McCarthy, J. F. (2001). *Decentralization, local communities and forest management in Barito Selatan District, Central Kalimantan*. Center for International Forestry Research, SMK Grafika Desa Putera, Indonesia.

- McDougall, C., Kaski ACM Team, & New ERA ACM Team. (2002a). Roles, relations, access and (in)equity: insights into gender and diversity in community forest management in Nepal, Indonesia and the Philippines. *CIFOR ACM Research Report*. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Mendoza, L.C., J.P. Brett, B.P. Tapang, G.A. Cruz, A.A. Colongon Jr., V.C. Diaz, M.C. San Luis & A.G. Follosco. (2004). *Harmonizing ancestral domain with local governance in the Cordillera of the Northern Philippines*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- MoA. (2003). *Mandates and functions of the Ministry of Agriculture*. Ministry of Agriculture, Royal Government of Bhutan, Bhutan.
- Nong, K. & M. Marschke. (2004). *Building networks of support for community-based coastal resource management in Cambodia*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- O'Hara, P. (2004). *Shaping the key to fit the lock: participatory action research and community forestry in the Philippines*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- Ojha, H., B. Pokharel, K. Paudel, & C. McDougall. (2002). *Stakeholder collaboration, adaptive management and social learning: a comparative review of eight community forestry sites in Nepal*. Forest Action and Center for International Forestry Research, Indonesia.
- Ojha, H.R. & N.P. Timsina. (2004). Civil forum and deliberative governance: The case of FECOFUN – RoKS. Federation of Community Forestry Users, Nepal.
- Osmani, S. R. (2000). *Participatory governance, people's empowerment and poverty reduction*. UNPD/SEPED Conference Paper Series, 5<sup>th</sup> year review of the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing) and the World Summit for Social Development.
- Pain, A., Pema, D. (2002). *Continuing Customs of Negotiation and Contestation in Bhutan*. Journal of Bhutan Studies.
- Phuong, P. X., (2001). *An Overview of the Forestry Policies Framework Related to Community Forest Management in Vietnam*. Workshop proceedings of the National Workshop on A Policy Framework to Support Community Forest Management in Vietnam, Hanoi, October 14-15, 2001.
- Pokharel, B., H. Neupane, H. Ojha, K. Paudel. (2002). Monitoring for Good Forest Governance: a review of micro-macro monitoring practices and linkages in community forestry system in Nepal. (Publisher unlisted)
- Qiao, F. (1997). *Property rights and forest land use in Southern China*. Unpublished master's thesis. Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences Graduate School, Beijing, China.
- Rambaldi, G., S. Bugna, A. Tiangco & D. De Vera. (2002). Bringing the vertical dimension to the negotiating table: preliminary assessment of a conflict resolution case in the Philippines. *ASEAN Biodiversity* – Special Reports, January – March.
- RGoB. (1995). *Forest and Nature Conservation Act*. Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Thimphu, Bhutan.
- RNRRC. (1997). CBNRM research in Lingmutey Chu watershed: characteristics of Lingmutey Chu, problem diagnosis and major research themes. Ministry of Agriculture, Royal Government of Bhutan, Bajo, Bhutan.

- Rudiyanto, A. (2002). *A Critical Appraisal of marine and Coastal Policy in Indonesia Including Comparative Issues and Lessons Learnts From Australia*. A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree – Doctor of Philosophy. University of Wollongong.
- Sakumoto, N. (2002). *The participatory forestry management system in Indonesia*. Policy Trend Report ,2002:52 – 76 - [www.iges.or.jp/en/fc/pdf/report5/PTR0205.pdf](http://www.iges.or.jp/en/fc/pdf/report5/PTR0205.pdf)
- Schlager, E., and E. Ostrom. (1992). *Property Rights Regimes and Natural Resources: A Conceptual Analysis*. Land Economics 68, no. 3 (1992): 249-62.
- Shrestha, N.K. & C. Britt. (1998). *From pilot to policy: community forestry comes of age in Nepal*. World Bank/WBI's CBNRM Initiative.
- Solar, R.W. (2005). *Investigating Mangrove Restoration Through Science, Community Knowledge and Socio-Cultural Orientations*. Unpublished masteral thesis. University of the Philippines, Los Banos.
- Sun Qiu. 2001. *Promotion of sustainable rural development by scaling up CBNRM approach in Guizhou province (project proposal)*. Guizhou Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Guiyang.
- Tiangco, A. (2000). *Government initiatives on the resolution of boundary conflicts and resource management in the Cordilleras*. Paper presented at the “The State Of Community Mapping & Resource Management Planning in the Philippines” Conference, IIRR, October 4-6, 2000.
- Ting, Z. (2002). *A Perspective on China's Yunnan Province*. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 [www.ref-msea.org/yunnan.pdf](http://www.ref-msea.org/yunnan.pdf)
- Tubtim, N. (2004). *Exclusion, accommodation and CBNRM: legitimizing the enclosure of a community fishery in Southern Laos*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- UNDP. (2000). *Decentralisation: Bringing Governance Closer to the People*. A Discussion Paper. United Nations Development Program in Bhutan. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from [http://www.undp.org.bt/discussion\\_papers/Decentralization.PDF](http://www.undp.org.bt/discussion_papers/Decentralization.PDF)
- Utting, P. (1993). *Trees, people and power: Social dimensions of deforestation and forest protection in Central America*. Earthscan, London.
- Van Tuyen, T., T.T. Chat, C.T.T. Hanh, D.V. Tinh, N.T. Thanh, N.T.T. Suong, L.T.N. Thuan & T.T. Phap. (2004). *Participatory local planning for resource governance in Tam Giang Lagoon, Vietnam*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.
- Wangchuck, S. (2001). Local resource management institutions: a case study on *sokshing* management. *Journal of Bhutan Studies*, 3(1): 1-47.
- Wardojo, W. & N. Masripatin. (2002). Trends in Indonesian forest policy. *Policy Trend Report*, 2002: 11-21
- Webb, E.L., & L. Dorji. (2004). *The evolution of forest-related institutions in Bhutan*. School of Environment, Resources and Development - Asian Institute of Technology and the Royal Society for the Protection of Nature, Bhutan.
- Wilkes, A. (2005). *Forest resource governance in an agro-pastoralist community in Northwest Yunnan: 'Institutional Bricolage' as a way of understanding the role of village autonomy in resource management*. Yunnan, China: Center for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge (CBIK),
- Yuan, J. & Q. Sun. (2004). *Scaling up CBNRM in Guizhou province, China*. Paper presented at the CBNRM Action Research and Policy Change in Asia Conference, Tagaytay, Philippines - May 17 – 24, 2004.

## Annex I. Resources for CBNRM Policy Advocacy

As indicated in the literature review, gaps in field-based CBNRM policy advocacy knowledge persists, and methodologies developed to deal with policy barriers and policy change are not widely documented and shared. To aid CBNRM field-based policy advocacy practitioners and to foster innovation in CBNRM policy advocacy initiatives, a resource 'tool box' summarizing existing and developing CBNRM policy advocacy practice-based tools and associated literature has been added.

**The Participatory Communication Strategy Design, A Handbook - 2nd edition** (SADC, 2004) has been prepared as a training and reference guide for designing and implementing Communication for Development Strategies for field projects. The Participatory Communication Strategy Design (PCSD) methodology is used to build on the results of the Participatory Rural Communication Appraisal (PRCA). PCSD outlines how to involve people in decision-making processes for effective communication planning and action.

The handbook presents a step-by-step methodology for participatory communication strategy design, and the principles for communication planning, message development, multimedia material production and the implementation of communication activities in the field. Although the handbook does not deal with the technical aspects of media production, it specifies the requirements for effective use of communication approaches, media and materials among rural communities. In this way users of the handbook will be able to plan, supervise and monitor the implementation of the whole communication strategy process. The methodology proposed by the PCSD handbook has been tested through several training workshops in Africa. It has also been applied with success to various development projects dealing with agriculture, health, education, income-generation, gender, water and sanitation, animal husbandry and poverty alleviation.

**Reference:** SADC. (2004). *Participatory communication strategy design - a handbook*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. SADC Centre of Communication for Development and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from [http://www.fao.org/sd/dim\\_kn1/kn1\\_050902\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/sd/dim_kn1/kn1_050902_en.htm)

**Promoting Policy Change - Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: A Resource Manual for CARE Program Managers** (Sprechmann and Pelton, 2001) focuses on *advocacy*, which the authors define as "a strategy to influence policy makers when they make laws and regulations, distribute resources, and make other decisions that affect peoples' lives." The principal aims of advocacy are to create policies, reform policies, and ensure policies are implemented. Tools and guidelines presented are designed to teach program managers about the concept of advocacy and to explore how it can help strengthen capacity in programming. Available in three languages, step-by-step instructions are provided for planning advocacy initiatives, as well as advice for successful implementation. These guidelines are intended to help communication practitioners.

**Reference:** Sprechmann, S. & E. Pelton. (2001). *Promoting policy change - advocacy tools and guidelines: a resource manual for CARE program managers*. Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from <http://www.careusa.org/getinvolved/advocacy/tools.asp>

**Power Tools** (IIED, 2004) is coordinated by IIED in partnership with NGOs and policy researchers in Africa, Latin America and Asia. This initiative develops and shares tools, tactics and approaches to ensure policy influence for change. Tools in the form of instruments, approaches, schemes, devices and methods (among many other synonyms) for tackling the differences in power that impede policies and institutions from achieving equitable natural resource management are presented and designed to power asymmetries between marginalized and marginalizers. The Resource Box contains the Power Tools: handbook to tools and resources for policy influence in natural resource management and 26 summary cards.

**Reference:** IIED. (2004). *Power tools: for policy influence in natural resource management*. International Institute for Environment and Development, London UK. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from <http://www.policy-powertools.org/>

**Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers** (ODI, 2004), is an initiative of the Overseas Development Institute's (ODI) Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) program, that has been looking at the links between research and policy for several years. It is now beginning a process of identifying, developing, distributing and delivering tools, resources and training support that can help researchers access policy processes, with the aim of using their research to contribute to more evidence-based and pro-poor policy. This handbook presents work-in-progress on tools for policy impact, specifically geared towards the needs of researchers. The tools are grouped under the headings Research Tools, Context Assessment Tools, Communication Tools, and Policy Influence Tools.

**Reference:** ODI. (2004). *Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers*. Overseas Development Institute, London. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from <http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/Documents/Tools> in pdf format.

**Communication and Natural Resource Management: Experience – Theory** (FAO, 2003) is a book written as a tool for people involved or interested in communication and natural resource management who seek a better understanding of how different theories and strategic change principles relate to actual practice. It is not, however, a book of theory nor is it an argument for one approach over another. Instead, it relates a variety of theories and change principles in simplified, almost schematic form, to a series of real initiatives in the field through interactive 'experiences'. It asks that the reader become a participant in a process that requires reading and analyzing each initiative using different theoretical lenses. Each 'experience' is organized around a theme, a learning objective, a description of an actual natural resource management and communication initiative, and one or two theoretical lenses through which to analyze the initiative. As the 'user' works through each 'experience', questions about the theory and change principles and how they relate to the initiative are asked. The idea is not to 'discover' the right approach but rather to create an interactive space that enables the 'user' to reflect on what might work in a particular context, and also on how different contexts may require different approaches, principles and theoretical frameworks.

**Reference:** FAO. (2003). *Communication and Natural Resource Management: Experience – Theory*. Food and Agricultural Administration of the United



Nations, Rome, Italy. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from  
<http://www.comminit.com/strategicthinking/stfaocommnm/sld-1692.html>

**Advocacy Strategies and Approaches: A Resource Manual for Community Advocates and Trainers in Advocacy in the Hindu Kush-Himalayas** (Subedi, N. R., 2005) and its companion Resource Manual, were developed for potential trainers of community-based organizations (CBOs) in the HKH region. The manuals are intended to provide useful guides for conducting regional and local-level training on advocacy applicable to a variety of mountain development issues and themes. The Resource Manual provides trainers with more in-depth material on subjects discussed in the training manual. The manuals attempt to provide clarity on the concept of advocacy and to help equip CBOs and their networks with tools, strategies, and techniques that will help them assist mountain people to advocate for appropriate strategies to address their social, economic, gender, and other issues, and to articulate their needs and perspectives to governments, policy makers, and development organizations. The manuals are also likely to appeal to development practitioners and others interested in promoting people-centered, sustainable mountain development.

**Reference:** Subedi, N. R. (2005). *Advocacy Strategies and Approaches: A Resource Manual for Community Advocates and Trainers in Advocacy in the Hindu Kush-Himalayas*. Kathmandu: International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development. 127p.

**Participatory Development Communication for Community-Based NRM: A Compendium of Support Reference Materials** (Rajasunderam, 2004) provides a series of participatory development communication concepts and strategies in practice in a multitude of contexts for CBNRM communications learning. Topics covered range from perspectives on participation, development models, communication for development, and participatory development communication in the context of CBNRM. The support reference materials are partnered to a learning and networking program in participatory development communication aimed at researchers and practitioners in the field of Environment and Natural Resources Management. Its objectives are to improve the kind of communication and participation researchers and practitioners create together with communities and other stakeholders and to reinforce the potential of research or development initiatives in helping communities overcoming poverty and engage in decision-making processes that effect their lives.

**Reference:** Rajasunderam C.V. (2004). *Participatory development communication for community-based NRM research: a compendium of support reference materials*. Isang Bagsak Network, College of Development Communication of the University of the Philippines. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from [http://www.isangbagsak.org/se\\_asia/compendium1.doc](http://www.isangbagsak.org/se_asia/compendium1.doc) and [http://www.isangbagsak.org/se\\_asia/compendium2.htm](http://www.isangbagsak.org/se_asia/compendium2.htm)

**Community-Driven Tools for Data Collection and Decision Making: The PISA Action Guide** (Bennet et al, 2004) represents a shift in predominant thinking about information for economic and social development. Developed in Mongolia over a four-year period by Pact International (a global organization that builds the capacity of local leaders and organizations to meet pressing social needs in countries around the world), Participatory Information Systems Appraisal (PISA) adapts a well-developed family of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools for today's information intensive economy,

where new Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) are increasingly promoted as tools for poverty alleviation, sustainable human development, and environmental management. The PISA approach systematically introduces and explains the concepts and strategies needed to make well informed, data-based decisions while empowering key stakeholders in the process.

**Reference:** Bennet C., E. Bloom, B. Kummer, J. Kwaterski, & G. Rivero. (2004). *Community-driven tools for data collection and decision making: the PISA action guide*. Pact International. Publications. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from [http://www.pactpublications.com/pdfs/PACTPISA\\_Book2.pdf](http://www.pactpublications.com/pdfs/PACTPISA_Book2.pdf)

**Involving the Community: A Guide to Participatory Development Communication** (Bessette, 2004) is a guide intended for people working in research and development. It introduces participatory development communication concepts, discusses effective two-way communication approaches, and presents a methodology to plan, develop and evaluate communication strategies to address the following questions:

- How can researchers and practitioners improve communication with local communities and other stakeholders?
- How can two-way communication enhance community participation in research and development initiatives and improve the capacity of communities to participate in the management of their natural resources?
- How can researchers, community members, and development practitioners improve their ability to effectively reach policymakers and promote change?

**Reference:** Bessette, G. (2004). *Involving the community: a guide to participatory development communication*. International Development Research Centre: Southbound and Ottawa. Retrieved on 13 November 2005 from [http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-52226-201-1-DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-52226-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html)